

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

Edited by

BENJAMIN D. MERITT

HAROLD F. CHERNISS, RICHARD M. HAYWOOD
KEMP MALONE, HENRY T. ROWELL

Honorary Editor

DAVID MOORE ROBINSON

VOLUME LXV

BALTIMORE: THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

LONDON: ARTHUR F. BIRD

PARIS: ALBERT FONTENOING

LEIPZIG: F. A. BROCKHAUS

1944

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0

750

*General
Direct*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME LXV.

No. 257.

	PAGE
Some Attic Commonplaces of Pity. By EDWARD B. STEVENS,	1
Repetition of Lines in Aristophanes. By HAROLD W. MILLER,	26
The Vernacular Proverb in Mediaeval Latin Prose. By † ARPÁD STEINER,	37
Boethius and the History of the <i>Organon</i> . By FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN,	69
"The Lily" in the Dance. By LILLIAN B. LAWLER,	75
A New Reading of the Germanicus Papyrus. By L. A. POST,	80
REVIEWS:	83
Cohen's <i>Judaica et Aegyptiaca: De Maccabaeorum Libro III Quaestiones Historicae</i> (RALPH MARCUS).—Colson's Philo with an English Translation, Vol. IX (RALPH MARCUS).— <i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i> , Vol. LI and Athenian Studies Presented to William Scott Ferguson (<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i> , Supplementary Volume I) (C. BRADFORD WELLES).—Bonner's The Literary Treatises of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (R. K. HACK).—Schubring's Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der hippokratischen Schrift <i>De locis in homine</i> (LUDWIG EDELSTEIN).—Wagenvoort's Imperium, Studiën over het "mana"-begrip in zede en taal der Romeinen (ARTHUR DARBY NOCK).—Mendell's Our Seneca (WILLIAM HARDY ALEXANDER).—Oliver's The Sacred Gerusia (T. ROBERT S. BROUGHTON).—Hudson's Desiderius Erasmus. The Praise of Folly. Translated from the Latin, with an Essay and Commentary (DON CAMERON ALLEN).—Clark's Eight American Praxapostoloi (MARBURY B. OGLE).	
BOOKS RECEIVED,	112

No. 258.

Suetonius in the Civil Service under Hadrian. By HENRY A. SANDERS,	113
Italic and Celtic. By MYLES DILLON,	124
Lucretius and the Sixth Book of the <i>Aeneid</i> . By AGNES KIRSOFF MICHELS,	135
The Method of Choosing Archons in Athens under the Empire. By JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS,	149
Cicero's Greek Text of Herodotus, I, 31. By WARREN E. BLAKE,	167
Latin <i>Uxor</i> . By FRITZ MEZGER,	170

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Notes on Greek Poetry. By RICHMOND LATTIMORE, - - -	172
Did Menander Nod? <i>Epitrepones</i> 53. By EDWARD CAPPS, - -	175
Tacitus' <i>Annals</i> , IV, 12. By C. ARTHUR LYNCH, - - -	179
REVIEWS: - - - - -	181
<i>Finley's Thucydides</i> (MALCOLM F. McGREGOR).— <i>Johnson and Goodrich's Papyri</i> in the Princeton University Collections, Volume III (†CLINTON W. KEYES).— <i>Dinsmoor's Observations on the Hephaisteion</i> (HOMER A. THOMPSON).— <i>Persson's The Religion of Greece in Prehistoric Times</i> (ERNST RIESS).— <i>Howe's The Pretorian Prefect from Commodus to Diocletian</i> (A.D. 180-305) (O. W. REINMUTH).— <i>Rose's The Eclogues of Vergil</i> (E. L. HIGHBARGER).— <i>Tait's Philodemus' Influence on the Latin Poets</i> (RICHARD M. HAYWOOD).— <i>Warmington's Remains of Old Latin</i> , Vol. III: <i>Lucilius; The Twelve Tables</i> (E. BOUCHER STEVENS).	
BOOKS RECEIVED, - - - - -	208

No. 259.

Homer and Hector. By FREDERICK M. COMBELLACK, - - -	209
A Reference to Plotinus in Liddell and Scott. By GORDON H. CLARK, 244	
<i>Agricola</i> , 28. By C. ARTHUR LYNCH, - - - - -	246
Note on Aeschylus' <i>Agamemnon</i> 557. By C. ARTHUR LYNCH, - -	247
<i>Nicomachean Ethics</i> , VI, 1142 b 19. By C. ARTHUR LYNCH, - -	248
Cotton in Graeco-Roman Egypt. By J. G. WINTER and H. C. YOUTIE, 249	
REVIEWS: - - - - -	259
<i>Nilsson's Geschichte der griechischen Religion</i> , erster Band, bis zur griechischen Weltherrschaft (CAMPBELL BONNER).— <i>Ehrenberg's The People of Aristophanes: A Sociology of Old Attic Comedy</i> (WILLIAM C. GREENE).— <i>Prentice's Those Ancient Dramas Called Tragedies</i> (WILLIAM C. GREENE).— <i>Little's Myth and Society in Attic Drama</i> (WARREN E. BLAKE).— <i>Haight's Essays on the Greek Romances</i> (WARREN E. BLAKE).— <i>Classical Studies in Honor of William Abbott Oldfather</i> (DOROTHY M. ROBATHAN).— <i>Arator, The Codices</i> , edited by A. P. McKinlay (DOROTHY M. ROBATHAN).— <i>Wolff's Written and Unwritten Marriages in Hellenistic and Post-Classical Roman Law</i> (MAX RADIN).— <i>Transactions of the International Numismatic Congress</i> Organized and Held in London by the Royal Numismatic Society, June 30-July 3, 1936, on the Occasion of its Centenary (DAVID M. ROBINSON).— <i>Weber's Schliemann's First Visit to America, 1850-1851</i> (DAVID M. ROBINSON).— <i>Yale Classical Studies</i> , VIII (ROBERT SAMUEL ROGERS and C. W. PEPPER).— <i>Prakken's Studies in Greek Genealogical Chronology</i> (MALCOLM F. McGREGOR).— <i>Amyx's Corinthian Vases in the Hearst Collection at San Simeon</i> (HAZEL PALMER).— <i>Mylonas' The</i>	

CONTENTS.

V

PAGE

Hymn to Demeter and her Sanctuary at Eleusis (JOSEPH FONTENROSE).—Pearson's The Local Historians of Attica (ANTONY E. RAUBITSCHEK).—Pritchett's The Five Attic Tribes after Kleisthenes (C. BRADFORD WELLES).—Skemp's The Theory of Motion in Plato's Later Dialogues (L. A. POST).—Lattimore's Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs (JAMES HUTTON).—Lehmann-Hartleben and Olsen's Dionysiac Sarcophagi in Baltimore (SARAH ELIZABETH FREE-MAN).—Dohan's Italic Tomb-Groups in the University Museum (GISELA M. A. RICHTER).—Kapp's Greek Foundations of Traditional Logic (PHILLIP DE LACY).—Wallace's The Notes on Philosophy in the Commentary of Servius on the Eclogues, the Georgics and the Aeneid of Vergil (LUDWIG EDELSTEIN).—Troupard's Cicero's Attitude towards the Greeks (GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH).—Nonnos, *Dionysiaca*, with an English Translation by W. H. D. Rouse, Mythological Introduction and Notes by H. J. Rose, and Notes on Text Criticism by L. R. Lind (Vols. I-III, Books I-XLVIII) (EUGENE O'NEILL, JR.).—Nachmanson's Der griechische Buchtitel. Einige Beobachtungen (FRIEDRICH WALTER LENZ).—Kirsopp and Silva Lake's Family 13 (The Ferrar Group). The Text according to Mark with a Collation of Codex 28 of the Gospels (FRIEDRICH WALTER LENZ).—Dowdell's Aristotle and Anglican Religious Thought (JOHN S. KIEFFER).

BOOKS RECEIVED, 319

No. 260.

Athenian Notes. By A. W. GOMME,	321
"Epic, as I here define it." By SEYMOUR M. PITCHER,	340
The Name of the Holy Grail. By LEO SPITZER,	354
Latin Dii Indigetes, Dii Novensides, and the Designation of IE Kinship. By FRITZ MEZGER,	364
Thomas Jefferson as a Philologist (II). By H. C. MONTGOMERY,	367
The Latin Base of the Spanish Suffix <i>-eno</i> . By YAKOV MALKIEL,	372
On the Unity of the <i>Miles Gloriosus</i> . By RICHARD M. HAYWOOD,	382
A Note on the <i>Nicomachean Ethics</i> . By GLENN R. MORROW,	386
REVIEWS:	

. Lobel, Roberts, and Wegener's The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XVIII. Edited with Translations and Notes (W. A. OLDFATHER and LLOYD W. DALY).—Venzke's Die orphischen Argonautika in ihrem Verhältnis zu Apollonios Rhodios (HERMANN FRÄNKEL).—Laistner and King's A Hand-List of Bede Manuscripts (S. HARRISON THOMSON).—Smith's Tiberius and the Roman Empire (VINCENT M. SCRAMUZZA).—Richter's Etruscan Art in the Museum. The Metropolitan Museum of Art: Handbook of the Etruscan Collection (DAVID M. ROBINSON).—Elferink's Het Oordeel van den Kerkvader Augustinus over de Romeinsche Oudheid. Bijdragen tot een commentaar op de eerste vijf boeken van "De Civitate Dei" (J. M. F.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
MARIQUE).—Weiss' Kausalität und Zufall in der Philosophie des Aristoteles (PHILLIP DE LACY).—Jones' <i>The Vänsdalers' Saga</i> . Translated with an Introduction and Notes (STEFÁN EINAESSON).—Turyn's The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus (ALFRED C. SCHLESINGER).—Webster's Greek Interpretations (ALFRED C. SCHLESINGER).	
BOOKS RECEIVED, - - - - -	419
INDEX TO VOLUME LXV, - - - - -	421

FEB 22 1944

VOL. LXV, 1

WHOLE NO. 257

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

Edited by

BENJAMIN D. MERITT

HAROLD F. CHERNISS, RICHARD M. HAYWOOD
KEMP MALONE, HENRY T. ROWELL

Honorary Editor

DAVID MOORE ROBINSON

JANUARY, 1944

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Some Attic Commonplaces of Pity. By EDWARD B. STEVENS,	1
Repetition of Lines in Aristophanes. By HAROLD W. MILLER,	26
The Vernacular Proverb in Mediaeval Latin Prose. By † ÁRPAD STEINER,	37
Boethius and the History of the <i>Organon</i> . By FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN,	69
"The Lily" in the Dance. By LILLIAN B. LAWLER,	75
A New Reading of the Germanicus Papyrus. By L. A. POST,	80
REVIEWS:	83

Cohen's Judaica et Aegyptiaca: De Maccabaeorum Libro III Quaestiones Historiae (RALPH MARCUS).—*Colson's Philo with an English Translation*, Vol. IX (RALPH MARCUS).—*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. LI and Athenian Studies Presented to William Scott Ferguson (*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Supplementary Volume I) (C. BRADFORD WELLES).—*Bonner's The Literary Treatises of Dionysius of Halicarnassus* (R. K. HACK).—*Schubring's Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der hippokratischen Schrift De locis in homine* (LUDWIG EDELSTEIN).—*Wagenvoort's Imperium, Studien over het "mana"-begrip in zede en taal der Romeinen* (ARTHUR DARBY NOCK).—*Mendell's Our Seneca* (WILLIAM HARDY ALEXANDER).—*Oliver's The Sacred Gerusia* (T. ROBERT S. BROUGHTON).—*Hudson's Desiderius Erasmus. The Praise of Folly. Translated from the Latin, with an Essay and Commentary* (DON CAMERON ALLEN).—*Clark's Eight American Praxapostoloi* (MARBURY B. OGLE).

BOOKS RECEIVED,	112
------------------------	------------

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology, and especially in the field of Greek and Roman studies. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage 25 cents extra); single numbers, \$1.50 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the editor, Benjamin D. Meritt; proof should be returned to the secretary, Evelyn H. Clift, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Contributors are entitled to receive twenty-five copies of their respective contributions free of charge. Additional copies will be supplied at cost.

Subscriptions, remittances, and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

The contents of the American Journal of Philology are indexed regularly in the International Index to Periodicals.

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. LXV, 1

WHOLE No. 257

SOME ATTIC COMMONPLACES OF PITY.

It happens that three important strands of Attic commonplace on pity are brought together in the speech which Thucydides assigns to Cleon on the occasion of the reconsideration by the Athenian assembly of its decree condemning to death the adult manhood of Mytilene and consigning the rest of the population to slavery.¹ I propose to avail myself of this conjunction of topics as the text or unifying principle for a discussion of the topics themselves. My primary purpose is not to analyze Cleon's speech or to indicate that it might or might not have been delivered as early as 427 B. C. in about the form which Thucydides gives it,² but rather to present a chapter in the history of the commonplace of pity. I find the following topics of pity in Cleon's speech: (1) the banishment of pity (*ἐκβολὴ ἐλέου*) ; (2) the foolish leniency of Athenian foreign policy; (3) the debilitating effect of the new sophistic rhetoric. Each of these topics is the negative development of a positive topic. My method for each of them will be first to establish the rhetorical identity of the positive topic and trace its development in both rhetorical and purely literary uses (by the latter I mean the instances of the topic which precede or seem not to be indebted to its rhetorical formulation); and, secondly, to follow the same procedure for the negative phase of the same topic. My discuss-

¹ Thucydides, III, 36, 2. I take this opportunity to acknowledge my obligation to the librarians of Columbia University and of the New York Public Library.

² It has been argued recently that the speeches in Thucydides' *History* are not inconceivably true reflections of the speeches they profess to report. See John H. Finley, Jr., "Euripides and Thucydides," *H. S. C. P.*, XLIX (1938), pp. 23-68. For Cleon's speech see pp. 47 f.

sion of the second and third topics will be limited to their pertinence to the commonplace of pity and will therefore not constitute a full treatment of these topics.

On the day after the Athenian assembly had dispatched a galley bearing the news of their Mytilenean decree, Thucydides tells us, "they straightway felt a kind of remorse, and, reconsidering their decree, recognized that it was cruel and terrible for a whole city to be destroyed instead of just those who were guilty." The Mytilenean embassy and their sympathizers among the Athenians, feeling the change of opinion, managed without much trouble to get the matter before the assembly again, as it was obvious that the majority wanted to reconsider it. Cleon begins the debate and shapes his discourse on the assumption that his adversary will appeal to the humane feelings which had prompted the reconsideration. His opening remark on the inability of a democracy to rule an empire he elucidates with an observation to the effect that the citizens of a democracy unconsciously apply to their relations with their allies the same sense of trust and confidence that animates their relations with one another. So it happens that Athenians, misled by stories or overcome by pity, fail to reckon that in giving in they are endangering themselves without conciliating their allies. For they do not stop to consider that their empire is really a tyranny.³

Bloomfield rightly called this passage a *praeoccupatio benevolentiae*. But Cleon's use of it is not the commoner rhetorical one of ingratiating his audience, since Cleon turns the topic into a serious warning concerning what he considers an Athenian weakness. This topic is then the second of those I have listed above.

Cleon then refers briefly to the fickleness of Athenians, and in an apology for the law as contrasted with the new sophistic cleverness he compares the ordinary type of citizen with the more intelligent to the advantage of the former. Further on (§ 38, 2), he says that his opponent will obviously be someone who has great reliance on his oratorical powers or someone who with the encouragement of a bribe has fashioned an elaborately worded speech. Once again (§ 40, 2) he warns the assembly against being misled by pleasant-sounding speeches and adds that on another less critical occasion the orators who take delight in

³ Thucydides, III, 37, 1-2.

words will have their tournament without its costing the city a great penalty for a little pleasure, and with a good fee for fine speaking. This depreciation of the sophistic rhetoric constitutes the third of the topics to which I have referred.

At § 38, 1 Cleon ironically asks whether his opponent will lay claim to showing that the wrongs done to Athens by the Mytileneans are to her advantage. Midway in the speech (§ 39, 1-2) he declares that he can excuse revolt in certain cases and then hastens on to the technical exaggeration⁴ of the enormity of the Mytilenean crime against Athens. A restatement of this thought marks the opening of the epilogue (§ 40), with emphasis laid on the point that the Mytileneans acted with malice prepense and do not therefore deserve to be pardoned. This topic is summarized in the sentence: "Pity should be reserved for equals and not shown to those who will not be merciful in turn, but must of necessity always be our foes."⁵ Here we have the first of the topics I have listed, that of the banishment of pity. It is brought into relation with the second topic in my list when Cleon says a few lines further on that indulgence should be shown to those who are likely to prove conformable in the sequel.

Immediately preceding the sentence just cited Cleon lists all three topics together and calls them the "three things most subversive of the empire": *τρισὶ τοῖς ἀξυμφορωτάτοις τῇ ἀρχῇ, οἰκτῷ καὶ ἡδονῇ λόγων καὶ ἐπιεικείᾳ.*

I

It is generally agreed that the earlier rhetorical handbooks consisted almost entirely of topical illustrations.⁶ It seems probable that Thrasymachus offered in his *"Ελεοί"* a sufficient variety of such illustrations to anticipate most, if not all, later practical applications of this general commonplace. But it is not within the scope of this paper to deal with all the subordinate

⁴ See Aristotle, *Rh.*, 1395 a 7-9 and Cope's commentary, II, pp. 213 f.

⁵ Thucydides, III, 40, 3. For *δμοίοις* = "equals" see Classen *ad loc.* and Paul Shorey, "On the Implicit Ethics and Psychology of Thucydides," *T. A. P. A.*, XXIV (1893), p. 73. C. F. Smith (*L. C. L.*) follows Jowett in his translation, "likewise compassionate."

⁶ See, e. g., W. Kroll at *R.-E.*, Supplementband VII, cols. 1044 and 1046. Cf. also the sensible remarks of D. A. G. Hinks, "Tisias and Corax and the Invention of Rhetoric," *C. Q.*, XXXIV (1940), pp. 65 f.

forms of the appeal to pity.⁷ The fundamental and all-embracing topic is the appeal to the vulnerability of the juror or, more generally, the audience. This basic topic the *Rhetoric to Alexander* expresses as follows: "Say that it is reasonable and just and expedient to forgive mistakes: for no man knows whether such a thing may not happen to himself."⁸ In place of the blunt advice of the *Rhetoric to Alexander* Aristotle incorporates the topic in his definition of pity. To arouse pity a misfortune must, he says,⁹ be such that the pitier may suppose that he or someone dear to him might suffer similarly. The possibility of such misfortune must not be too remote from the pitier. Moreover, the pitier must be the sort of person who would suppose that such a misfortune could happen to himself or one dear to him. The utterly desperate and the insolently prosperous will not feel pity, nor will he who believes that all men are bad, since he will suppose that all deserve to suffer. From the sections in Aristotle's chapter in which he discusses the things and the persons that may arouse pity, and the means of heightening pathetic effects, might be extracted the topics of pity subordinate to this larger and more inclusive topic. Suffice it to observe here that the subordination of such practical topics of pity as that of the "fall from on high," the "then and now," or the appeal in the name of one dear to him whose compassion is sought is maintained in later treatments of pity. Cicero says of the *conquestio*, which he defines as "oratio auditorum misericordiam captans":

in hac primum animum auditoris mitem et misericordem conficere oportet, quo facilius conquestione commoveri possit. Id locis communibus efficere oportebit, per quos fortunae vis in omnes et hominum infirmitas ostenditur; qua oratione habita graviter et sententiose maxime demittitur animus hominum et ad misericordiam comparatur, cum in alieno malo suam infirmitatem considerabit.¹⁰

⁷ For a treatment of subordinate topics such as the "then and now" and the "fall from on high," see Ludwig Mader, *Über die hauptsächlichsten Mittel, mit denen Euripides Eleos zu erregen sucht* (Erlangen, 1907), pp. 58-63. Cf. also Decharme, *Euripide* (Paris, 1893), pp. 275-95; and Kurt Witte, *Quaestiones Tragicae* (Vratislaviae, 1908), pp. 5-61.

⁸ *Rh. Gr.*, I (ed. Spengel-Hammer), p. 93, 6-8 (= 1444 a 12-14).

⁹ *Rh.*, 1385 b 13 ff.

¹⁰ *De Inv.*, I, 106. Cf. the *Ad Herennium*, II, 50.

Cicero then lists sixteen *loci communes*, the first of which is the "fall from on high" topic and the seventh the appeal in the name of a loved one. Similarly, Apsines, advising the orator to prepare his listeners for the appeal to pity, suggests that he remind them that they who show pity to others are more likely to obtain mercy themselves if they shall ever need it.¹¹ After a few such preparatory remarks, Apsines considers in detail the subordinate topics of pity.

So much for the identity of the topic in rhetorical handbooks. Its literary development must be studied separately, since with respect to any commonplace of Greek thought it is safer to assume that the rhetoricians formulated what was ready at hand than that they discovered a new line of thought. There are numerous references to pity and mercy in Homer's epics, but the nearest approach to the topic under discussion is the singularly effective instance of the subordinate topic of the appeal in the name of one dear to him whose pity is sought, which we find in the plea of Priam to Achilles.¹² Somewhat nearer to later formulations are the two lines of Theognis (159-60) :

*Μήποτε, Κύρν', ἀγορᾶσθαι ἔπος μέγα· οἶδε γὰρ οὐδείς
ἀνθρώπων ὅ τι νὺξ χῆμέρη ἀνδρὶ τελεῖ.*

Paul Shorey found in these lines a "suggestion of the noblest thought of mature Greek ethics, the idea that the mutability of fortune and our common frailty impose the duty of lenience and compassion upon all men."¹³ And it is probably from this larger Greek sense of the instability of fortune that was derived the basic appeal-to-pity topic.¹⁴ Such a relationship is indicated in the earliest instance of the topic in the *Ajax* of Sophocles, where Odysseus, learning the deep lesson of compassion and humanity from the spectacle of the mad behavior of Ajax (121 ff.), declares: "For all he is my foe, I pity him. . . . Not more to his fate look I than my own." Athena endorses his

¹¹ See *Rh. Gr.*, I, p. 307, 10-13. For Apsines' discussion of the *topoi* of pity see pp. 306-26.

¹² *Iliad*, XXIV, 486 ff.

¹³ Hastings' *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, s. v. "Theognis."

¹⁴ Witte, *op. cit.*, p. 26, cites Euripides, *Suppl.*, 269 and *Hec.*, 282, as examples of the appeal-to-pity topic, though they are really concerned only with the larger commonplace of the instability of fortune.

lesson in lines that expand Theognis' distich. Towards the end of the same play Odysseus reverts to this thought when he justifies his insistence that Ajax be given due burial with the remark (1365): *καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐνθάδ’ ἔξοπλι*.

Some thirty years later Sophocles returns to the topic in the *Philoctetes* and the *Trachiniae*. In the latter play Deianira's joy at the news of her husband's return is tempered by a "strange pity" for the trains of exiles whom he had sent ahead, and she declares that a sensible person does not in prosperity dismiss the fear of a reversal of fortune (296 ff.). Philoctetes' supplication of Neoptolemus (*Ph.* 501-6) offers an explicit development of the commonplace. And in Sophocles' last play, the *Oedipus Coloneus* (565 ff.), Theseus motivates his intention to give succor to the stranger, Oedipus, with the remark that he knows he is a man and as such one whose share may be no greater than that of Oedipus on the morrow.

The freedom with which the dramatists handle the ethical idea that he shall have pity who shows pity to others is illustrated in a number of corollaries drawn from the larger topic. Aristotle observes that those who are completely ruined will not be inclined to pity, since they will regard themselves as immune to further suffering.¹⁵ This dictum is belied by Ajax, who in his extreme distress feels pity for Tecmessa and his son,¹⁶ but, when Philoctetes is about to mourn the death of Achilles, Neoptolemus reminds him that he has enough sorrows of his own without mourning for his neighbor's woe.¹⁷ Allied to this thought is the notion that one who has been treated pitilessly is justified in being pitiless. Iphigenia, in Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*, interprets a dream to mean that her brother is dead, and so expects to be moved less by compassion for the strangers newly come to the Tauri.¹⁸ To judge from its use in Latin comedy, this topic probably occurred frequently in the New Comedy.¹⁹ But passages of this tenor are perhaps more suggestive of the topic of the banishment of pity to which I shall advert later. Such

¹⁵ *Rh.*, 1385 b 19.

¹⁶ Sophocles, *Ajax*, 652 f.

¹⁷ Sophocles, *Phil.*, 337-40.

¹⁸ Lines 344-53. There is a faint suggestion of this idea in Sophocles, *O. C.*, 1356-9.

¹⁹ See my paper, "Topics of Pity in the Poetry of the Roman Republic," *A. J. P.*, LXII (1941), pp. 436 f.

too is Prometheus' expression of indignation that though he commiserated mortals he himself was deemed unworthy of compassion.²⁰ Another turn given to the topic is especially worthy of notice. Aristotle says that those who have suffered will be inclined to feel pity.²¹ Vergil's Dido occurs to one,²² but Aeschylus gives the thought a Christian turn when he has Danaus and the suppliant maidens invoke Apollo because he, having himself known the lot of mortals, may in very truth feel compassion for them.²³ Finally, the appeal to pity may become an appeal to duty, with the implied formula that he who has been the beneficiary of mercy is obliged to reciprocate in kind. In a stichomythic dialogue in the *Hercules Furens* of Euripides Theseus justifies his stubborn loyalty to his friend Heracles with a reference to a time when he was befriended by Heracles (1236) :

ἔγὼ δὲ πάσχων εὗ τότ’ οἰκτίρω σε νῦν.

Hecuba, pleading for pity for Polyxena, reminds Odysseus how she spared him when he supplicated her.²⁴

A large political aspect of the topic seems to be implied in the lines of Poseidon in Euripides' *Troades* (95-7) :

μῶρος δὲ θνητῶν ὅστις ἐκπορθεῖ πόλεις,
ναούς τε τύμβους θ', ἵερὰ τῶν κεκμηκότων,
έρημίᾳ δοὺς αὐτὸς ἄλεθ' ὕστερον.

Scholars have noticed the resemblance of this passage to Thucydides' use of the topic in the Melian Dialogue.²⁵ This dialogue has been discussed recently by Georges Méautis, who remarks upon the "more humane point of view, that of understanding

²⁰ Aeschylus, *Prom.*, 239-41 (ed. Murray).

²¹ *Rh.*, 1385 b 24 f.

²² *Aeneid*, I, 630.

²³ Aeschylus, *Suppl.*, 214-16. Cf. also the couplet from comedy (Philemon, Frag. 230 K.) : ἐκ τοῦ παθεῖν γίνωσκε καὶ τὸ συμπαθεῖν· | καὶ σοὶ γὰρ ἄλλος συμπαθήσεται παθών.

²⁴ Euripides, *Hec.*, 239 ff.

²⁵ Cf. Gilbert Murray, *Euripides and His Age*, p. 130; and Finley, *loc. cit.*, p. 55. A fragment of Euripides' *Andromeda* (130) brings out the relation of the topic to the more general ethical feeling against insolence. Cf. Euripides, *Ino*, Frag. 406; and Isocrates, *ad Dem.*, 29; and a number of *sententiae* gathered by Stobaeus (ed. W. et H., V, pp. 1008-11) under the heading, "We ought not to exult over others' misfortune."

and compassion," which at Thucydides, V, 90, the Melians offer in opposition to the hard logic of expediency urged upon them by the Athenians.²⁶ For τὸ κοινὸν ἀγαθόν, the principle on which the Melians base their plea, Méautis suggests *solidarité*, an improvement over such translations as "abstract justice" or "the common good," but not so enlightening as Shorey's interpretation of the phrase as "that reasonable forbearance towards the vanquished and the weak of which the Melians warn the Athenians that they too may one day stand in need."²⁷ The plea is even more explicit in two other places in Thucydides' *History*. The Plataeans beg the Lacedaemonians to regard them with a pity that would be the better part of wisdom, seeing that (among other reasons) calamity partakes of uncertainty and may befall anyone, howsoever innocent he may be (III, 59, 1). Again, in a chapter of questionable authenticity but eminently Thucydidean purport, this impetus to morality is said to be eclipsed by the desire of vengeance in times of great confusion and lawlessness: "Men see fit in their desire to avenge themselves upon others to cancel utterly those common laws touching the safeguards on which rest every man's hope that he may be preserved from ruin if ever he shall be in peril and shall need the right of appeal to one of them."²⁸

Navarre has discussed the somewhat formal appeals to pity of the forensic court,²⁹ which are generally couched in one of the subordinate forms of the topic,³⁰ and it is unnecessary to carry

²⁶ "Le Dialogue des Athéniens et des Méliens," *Rev. Ét. Gr.*, XLVIII (1935), pp. 250-78. For Thucydides, V, 90, see pp. 258 ff. Méautis rightly insists that clemency, pity, and compassion are not uniquely Christian, but the instances with which he illustrates them, the mercy shown to Ixion by Zeus and to Orestes by Athena, are not especially relevant to the topic used in the Melian Dialogue, since in neither of these instances was the mercy motivated by the possibility that the compassionate one might some day need compassion.

²⁷ See Shorey, *loc. cit.*, p. 86, n. 2.

²⁸ III, 84, 3. Against the Scholiast's rejection of this chapter, its authenticity is defended by Jowett, *ad loc.*; E. Schwartz, *Das Geschichtswerk des Th.*, pp. 284-7; E. Beintker, *Versuch einer neuen Erklärung von Th. III, 84 u. 67* (Anklam, 1900), pp. 1-11; and F. Rittelmeyer, *Th. u. d. Sophistik* (Borna-Leipzig, 1915), p. 69. I translate the text of the *O. C. T.*

²⁹ See O. Navarre, *La Rhet. Gr. avant Arist.*, p. 315, n. 1 and pp. 317-20.

³⁰ Cf., e.g., the earliest examples: Antiphon, *Tetralogy B*, α', 2 and β',

the history of this topic further, unless it be to observe the lasting ethical power of the idea as it appears as one of the Beatitudes,³¹ in La Rochefoucauld's definition of pity,³² and in Shakespeare's well-known tirade on mercy.³³

If in order to meet with mercy one must show mercy to others, it follows that one who has not shown mercy to others deserves no mercy himself. Such is the primary topic of the ἐκβολὴ ἐλέου, though this topic too has many subordinate topics or devices. The term itself does not appear save in the later rhetorical handbooks and scholia.³⁴ But the topic, if not the term, must have had a place in handbooks of the last quarter of the fifth century before Christ. A very clear example is found in Antiphon's early oration, *Against the Stepmother*. In the epilogue the orator is obviously seeking to forestall the effects of the stepmother's plea for pity when he asks whether the deceased is not more to be pitied than the murderer (§ 25), when he demands that the jury and justice deal as pitilessly with her as she had dealt with her husband, and when he asks (§ 26): πῶς οὖν ταύτην ἐλεεῖν ἀξιόν
ἔστιν ἡ αἰδοῦς τυγχάνειν . . . ἢτις αὐτὴν οὐκ ἡξίωσεν ἐλεῆσαι τὸν ἑαυτῆς
ἀνδρα . . . Moreover, a fragment of Antiphon's defense of himself in 411-410 B. C. is evidence that his prosecutor had already used the topic of the banishment of pity.³⁵ These examples

11. Aristophanes made great fun of these ἐλεεινολογίαι, *Wasps*, 586 ff., yet they seem to have been effective at times. Cf. A. P. Dorjahn, "Extenuating Circumstances in Athenian Courts," *Class. Phil.*, XXV (1930), p. 171. Cf. the statement made by the State Supreme Court of New Jersey in reversing a \$25,000 injury verdict: ". . . Where it is confidently inferred that the verdict has been fabricated by the influence of sympathy, or passion, or prejudice, or founded upon mistake, the remedial power to grant a new trial should be exercised" (*New York Herald Tribune*, September 3, 1941, p. 21).

³¹ See Matthew, v, 7; xviii, 33; Luke, vi, 36 f.

³² *Maximes*, 264: C'est une habile prévoyance des malheurs où nous pouvons tomber.

³³ *M. of V.*, IV, i, 198 ff.: "We do pray for mercy, | And that same prayer doth teach us all to render | The deeds of mercy." Cf. also an unsigned article, "Pity," in the *New Statesman*, XVII (1921), p. 325: "Pity is the recognition of one of the most obvious facts of human life—the fact that every man is a doomed creature—doomed to die and doomed to a great deal of intermediate unhappiness before he dies."

³⁴ Navarre, *op. cit.*, p. 315, refers to the topic as ἐλέου εἰσβολή, which must be a misprint. Cf. the use of ἐκβάλλω = "drive off the stage," Demosthenes, *De Fals. Leg.*, 337; and cf. Haigh, *Attic Theatre*, p. 345.

³⁵ Antiphon, *Περὶ τῆς μεταστάσεως*, 3.

prove that the banishment-of-pity topic had a place in Antiphon's rhetorical instruction,³⁶ and we may safely assume that the same commonplace appeared in Thrasymachus' "Ελεοι, for Thrasymachus must have been as adept at frustrating the appeal to pity as he was at "dispelling prejudices."³⁷ The *Rhetoric to Alexander*³⁸ offers suggestions for counteracting the appeal for pardon (*συγγνώμη*),³⁹ some of which are very common in the development of this topic: (1) the orator may argue the bad precedent to be set by pardoning the defendant; (2) he may remind the jury that the legislator does not pardon those who have made a mistake; (3) he must try to implant in the jury's mind hostility, wrath, or envy towards his opponents, and win friendliness, good will, or pity for himself.

Aristotle's suggestions for frustrating the appeal to pity are mostly concerned with the third of these methods. Immediately following the treatment of *ἔλεος* (1386 b 9 ff.) Aristotle discusses *νέμεσις*, which, he says, is the nearest opposite to pity, for we ought to grieve and feel pity for those who fare ill without deserving to do so, whereas we ought to feel *νέμεσις* for those who prosper without deserving to do so. Envy (*φθόνος*) is opposed to pity less sharply, since we may envy those who are deservedly prosperous, those who are equals and like ourselves; and the feeling of pleasure at another's misfortune (*ἐπιχαιρεκακία*) is still another kind of opposite to pity. Aristotle explains that envy of another's good fortune and pleasure in another's misfortune are good or bad sentiments according as the former deserves his good fortune or the latter his misfortune. All three feelings are obstructive of pity (*κωλυτικὰ . . . ἔλεον*), and so all are alike useful for making things seem not to be pitiable (1387 a 3-5).

³⁶ Whether the oration, *Against the Stepmother*, was actually delivered or not does not affect my argument. But if, as recent editors maintain, the speech was delivered before the Areopagus (see the introductions of Gernet in the "Budé" edition and of Maidment in the *L. C. L.*), the delivery must antedate the law which forbade the use of emotional appeals before the Areopagus (Aristotle, *Rh.*, 1354 a 22 ff.; Cope, I, pp. 7 f.; and Navarre, *op. cit.*, pp. 226 and 317).

³⁷ Plato, *Phaedr.*, 267 c-d.

³⁸ *Rh. Gr.*, I, pp. 90, 22-91, 17 (= 1443 a 38-1443 b 18).

³⁹ Schmidt, *Ethik d. Gr.*, II, p. 293, points out that *ἔλεος* and *συγγνώμη* are repeatedly used as interchangeable words. For the figure called *συγγνώμη* see Navarre, *op. cit.*, p. 269, and Syrianus, *In Hermog.*, pp. 148-50 (ed. Rabe).

The next chapter discusses the state of mind of one who feels *νέμεσις* and the objects and causes of the feeling. For example, a person who both deserves and enjoys a certain degree of prosperity will feel *νέμεσις* for another who undeservingly enjoys the same degree of prosperity, or for another who deserves it but obtained it with much less effort than himself. The loss of such undeserved or too easily gained prosperity will be an occasion for pleasurable feeling on the part of the deserving possessor of such prosperity who felt *νέμεσις*. (Aristotle neglects to add that the emotion will then cease to be *νέμεσις* and will become *ἐπιχαιρεκακία*.) If the speech can implant such a frame of mind in the judges (i. e., make them feel *νέμεσις* or *ἐπιχαιρεκακία* for one for whom if pardoned they would feel *νέμεσις*), and if the speech can show that those who ask for pity do not deserve it and that the occasion for which they ask for pity is not such as to deserve pity, and that in fact both persons and occasion deserve not to be pitied, it will be impossible for the judges to feel pity (1387 b 18-21).

The anonymous commentator on Aristotle's *Rhetoric* closes his treatment of the section on *νέμεσις* with the further explanatory note on the effect the speech has if it induces the judges to feel *νέμεσις*: ὁ γὰρ λόγος ἐκβολὴν ἐλέους [sic] ἐποίησεν.⁴⁰ Cicero treats the topic under the heading of *indignatio*,⁴¹ Quintilian discusses the use of a timely jest to upset the effect of the *miseratio*,⁴² and the later rhetorician Hermogenes offers a number of commonplaces in which the topic may be developed,⁴³ most of which are treated by Ioannes Sardianus.⁴⁴

It is now in order to trace the development of the banishment-of-pity topic, but we must first observe how near it comes to being explicit in Homer's *Iliad* (V, 55 ff.). The passage is one which has troubled many, for in it Homer seems to pass a

⁴⁰ Anon., *In Artem Rh. Comm.*, p. 114, 7 (ed. Rabe).

⁴¹ Cicero, *De Inv.*, I, 100.

⁴² VI, 1, 46-9. Quintilian does not approve of a famous orator who threw dice to the children brought in for the *miseratio*. The children grabbed the dice and started playing, but, says Quintilian, their very unawareness of their plight could have the effect of arousing pity. He is probably thinking of Euripides, *Medea*, 48.

⁴³ *Rh. Gr.*, VI, p. 14, 5 (ed. Rabe).

⁴⁴ *Comm. in Aphthonii Progymnasmata* (*Rh. Gr.*, XV), p. 102, 16 ff. (ed. Rabe).

favorable moral judgment upon a counsel of atrocity. Menelaus has captured Adrastus. Adrastus grasps his knees in supplication and asks his captor to take him alive and get the rich ransom which his father will gladly give. Menelaus is nearly persuaded and is on the point of turning his captive over to an attendant to be taken back to the swift ships when Agamemnon runs to meet him and shouting at him asks why Menelaus has such concern for the foe and adds with bitter irony: $\eta\; \sigmaοι\; \alphaριστα\; πεποίηται\; κατα\; οικον\; | \; προς\; Τρώων$. The remark is followed by the passionate wish that none of the Trojans—not even the male child in its mother's womb—shall escape sheer destruction by the Danaans, but that all alike shall perish uncared for and utterly. The expression of such a wish in the heat of battle is of itself more powerfully dramatic than it is savage, just as Achilles' wish that he had the desire and the heart to eat the flesh of Hector raw is no evidence of unexpurgated cannibalism but constitutes rather a vivid indication of the angry tension under which Achilles is laboring (XXII, 346 f.). But when Homer adds: "Thus speaking he changed the intent of his brother with righteous advice" (VI, 61 f.), we cannot but wonder what Homer means by the phrase $αισιμα\; παρειπών$ here, and why, though elsewhere he condemns human sacrifice (*Il.*, XXIII, 176), he here seems to approve of a war atrocity. One answer, I believe, is that Agamemnon's advice is "righteous" with the kind of righteousness argued in the later topic of the banishment of pity, the regular procedure of which is to prove that the opponent has by his cruelty forfeited a claim to compassion. But it should be observed that this implication is only to be found in Agamemnon's question. There is no contrast drawn between the cruelty of Agamemnon and the humanity of Menelaus.⁴⁵ The same principle of decision is found later in the *Hecuba* of Euripides, where Agamemnon rules in favor of Hecuba after her rhetorical debate with Polymestor (1250 ff.), and the writer of the play's *Hypothesis* comments: $\epsilonκρίθη\; γάρ\; οὐκ\; αρέσαι\; ωμότητος,\; \alphaλλ'\; \alphaμύνασθαι\; τὸν\; κατάρξαντα$. Another such approximation to the topic occurs in the lines in the same play in which Odysseus fends off the

⁴⁵ Cf. *contra*, Grace H. Macurdy, *The Quality of Mercy*, pp. 20 f. Agamemnon's advice is "righteous" also because military necessity for the moment demands, as Nestor says at 67 ff., that no man linger behind to throw himself upon the spoils.

appeal which he expects to hear from Hecuba by reminding her of the pitiable old men and women and widowed young brides whose sons or husbands lie buried near Mt. Ida (321-5).

It is significant that in the *Eumenides* of Aeschylus, the play which so dramatically depicts the conflict between mercy and justice, in a great chorus in which are embodied the three primary laws of the old society—honor god, parents, and the stranger⁴⁶—the appeal to Justice is founded on the two commonest forms of the banishment-of-pity topic, that of the dangerous precedent and that of the greater pitiableness of the party injured by the suppliant, in this case the many fathers and mothers of the future who will suffer by reason of the precedent set if Orestes be pardoned—some one of whom may in the agony of the fresh wound dealt by a child call in vain upon Justice “whose house is even now falling” (496-8 and 508-16). Sophocles, too, uses this topic in his treatment of the same myth. At the moment when Orestes is about to strike and his mother begs most frantically for pity, Electra in cold fury reminds her that she had no pity on Orestes or on his father.⁴⁷ A distinctly rhetorical use of the topic occurs in Euripides’ *Orestes*. Tyndareus, in a tirade in which he has represented himself as a staunch upholder of social order and has reduced the law of retaliation to an absurdity, suddenly directs his speech to Orestes, asking him what his feelings were when his mother held forth her breast in appeal to him (526-9), and, striking a telling blow at Orestes’ case, makes the point that, though Clytemnestra deserved to die, it was not fitting that her son administer justice to her.⁴⁸ Orestes responds with a longer tirade in which among other arguments he asserts that far from deserving to be stoned to death he has in fact done a service to all Greece: “For if wives are to go to such extremes of boldness that they murder their husbands and make sanctuary in their children by exposing

⁴⁶ *Eum.*, 538-49. Cf. also 270 f. and *Suppl.*, 704-9.

⁴⁷ Sophocles, *El.*, 1411 f. Cf. J. T. Sheppard’s remarks on this passage, “The Tragedy of Electra, According to Sophocles,” *C. Q.*, XII (1918), p. 88.

⁴⁸ Aristotle, *Rh.*, 1401 a 35 ff., quotes a line from Theodectes’ *Orestes*—“it is just for her who killed her husband” to die—as an example of the fallacy of division or of omission, of the latter because the sentence omits reference to the agent.

their breasts in that appeal to pity of which you prate,⁴⁹ then there is nothing to prevent them from slaying their husbands on any pretext whatsoever."

The tradition that Thucydides was a pupil of Antiphon⁵⁰ sorts well with Thucydides' use, after Antiphon, of the banishment-of-pity topic. There is only a suggestion of this topic in the Athenian reply to the Melians' appeal to pity.⁵¹ But in the epilogue of the speech made by the Thebans in their attempt to contravene the Plataeans' appeal for mercy, the Lacedaemonians are urged not to be softened by the Plataeans' recital of their ancient merits: "While merits may be cited to the advantage of a wronged people, they are arguments for doubling the punishment of a people that has committed ignominy, seeing that their crime is a betrayal of the standard that they have set for themselves. Let not tears nor lamentation avail them aught, what with their appeals to the tombs of your fathers and to their own isolation." Then the Boeotians weigh against the Plataeans' claim to mercy the disaster suffered by their own young men when they were intercepted and cut down by the Plataeans as they were rushing to help the Lacedaemonians at Coronea, and conclude: "Quite worthy of pity are those who suffer a fate undeserved—but on the contrary, it is a matter for rejoicing when men suffer their just deserts, as do these."⁵²

Instances of the topic in later Attic oratory are true to type and call for no special comment, save that we may note that Demosthenes seems to have had a predilection for this topic.⁵³

⁴⁹ For the exposure of the breast as an appeal to pity, see my note on Ovid, *Met.*, X, 391-3 in *C. W.*, XXXV (1942), p. 231.

⁵⁰ Cf. Marcellinus, *Vit. Thuc.*, 22, and F. Blass, *Att. Beredsamkeit*², p. 97. I do not mean to imply that the tradition is at all confirmed by such a parallel in the use of topics which were common property.

⁵¹ Such a suggestion seems implied in the Athenian declaration that Athens is less concerned for the possible end of her empire or for her subjection to Sparta than she is alarmed at the prospect of a subject people's attacking and conquering her (Thucydides, V, 91, 1).

⁵² Thucydides, III, 67. The Scholiast comments on this chapter: ἐκβολὴ ἐλέου.

⁵³ Cf. Sardianus, *loc. cit. supra*, note 44. The Scholiast on Demosthenes discusses the topic often. See Dindorf's edition, pp. 438, 4 ff.; 540, 26; 546, 2 ff.; 574, 4 ff.; 759, 23 ff. The Scholiast's references are to Demosthenes, *In Mid.*, 100 and 186 ff.; *In Tim.*, 196 ff.; and *De Fals. Leg.*, 309 f. At *In Mid.*, 100 Demosthenes, after anticipating his

The contrariety of mercy and justice implicit in the topic is epitomized in a fragment of Euripides: *οὐ τῶν κακούργων οἴκτος ἀλλὰ τῆς δίκης*.⁵⁴ This is nearly Shakespeare's "Mercy but murders, pardoning those that kill."⁵⁵ For the law is that "he shall have judgment without mercy, that hath shewed no mercy."⁵⁶

II

The second of the topics of pity in Cleon's speech is that of the *ἐπιεικεία* or leniency of the Athenian character. Cleon warns the assembly of this Athenian attribute as of a fault, but his treatment is exceptional, for the fault is more often cited as a topic of praise. As such it frequently takes the form of a reference to the *ἀβουλία* of Athens, her folly in espousing the cause of weaker states when she had nothing to gain in so doing.⁵⁷ This topic of praise seems primarily to have derived from treatments of mythical instances of such a policy of sentiment. Such instances are celebrated in the *Heracleidae* and *Supplices* of Euripides and are referred to by Herodotus at VIII, 142 and IX, 27. The dates of these two plays of Euripides and of the composition of Herodotus, VII-IX, are not well enough established to warrant our setting a date for the first appearance of the topic, but its presence in Herodotus VIII and IX, which

opponent's *miseratio*, which he says is the only defense left to him (cf. Publius Syrus, 312 R.: *mala causa est quae requirit misericordiam*), arrives at the standard formulation: *οὐδεὶς γάρ ἐστι δίκαιος τυγχάνειν ἐλέον τῶν μηδέν' ἔλεούντων, οὐδὲ συγγνώμης τῶν ἀσυγγνωμόνων*. Cf. also the *miseratio* which Lycurgus in his oration, *Against Leocrates*, builds up for the Athens of the first dark days after the battle of Chaeronea. Stigmatizing Leocrates' flight from Athens at that time as cruel treatment of his city, which might, for all he cared, have perished with all its inhabitants, Lycurgus asks (§ 148): "Who is so foolish . . . as to choose to show mercy to this man and as a consequence be mercilessly destroyed by the enemy . . . ?"

⁵⁴ Euripides, Frag. 270.

⁵⁵ *R. and J.*, III, i, 196.

⁵⁶ Epistle of James, ii, 13.

⁵⁷ Many references are gathered by Burgess, *Epideictic Literature* (Chicago, 1902), p. 151, where, however, they are wrongly listed as examples of *δυσβουλία Ἀθηναῖων*. This phrase seems to refer only to the "muddling-through" policy of Athens. See my paper, "Topics of Counsel and Deliberation in Pre-philosophic Greek Literature," *Class. Phil.*, XXVIII (1933), p. 113.

may have been composed about 445 B. C.,⁵⁸ and the probability that Aeschylus' *Heracleidae* anticipated in part the plot of Euripides' play of the same name⁵⁹ indicate a date from ten to twenty years preceding the probable date of Euripides' *Heracleidae*.⁶⁰ The topic was adopted as a set theme by the writers of panegyrics and thus appears in the *Menexenus* of Plato, where it is said that, if anyone wished to accuse Athens justly, the only correct charge he could bring against her would be that she was always too much inclined to pity and too ready to champion the weaker cause.⁶¹ It would be natural for the forensic advocate, seeking to prejudice the jury in his favor, to adapt this topic to his own uses, thus making it one of the formal topics in the *praeoccupatio benevolentiae* of the forensic *exordium*.⁶²

Whether Athenians were actually more easily touched with pity than others may be questioned,⁶³ but the contrast drawn in Euripides' *Supplices* (187-90) between the cruelty of Sparta and the compassion of Athens represents a definite conviction on the part of Athens as to her character. An early instance of such a popular capacity for pity is the outburst of tears attendant upon the presentation of Phrynicus' *Sack of Miletus* in 494 B. C., when Athenians were so touched that they passed a decree fining the poet "for reminding them of their own troubles" and forbidding a second exhibit of the play.⁶⁴ Plato and

⁵⁸ I. e., on Bauer's theory. Cf. How and Wells, *Commentary on Herodotus*, I, pp. 14 f.

⁵⁹ Cf. Smyth, *Aeschylus (L. C. L.)*, II, p. 404.

⁶⁰ Cf. Murray's note on the date of the *Heracleidae* in *O. C. T.* J. A. Spranger ("The Political Element in the *Heracleidae* of Euripides," *C. Q.*, XIX [1925], pp. 124-8) would date the play as late as 419 B. C., but his argument is not convincing.

⁶¹ 244 e: ὡς ἀεὶ λιαν φιλοκτήμων ἔστι καὶ τοῦ ἥπτον θεραπίς. There is a glance at this topic, perhaps, in Gorgias' *Epitaphios* in the words: πολλὰ μὲν δὴ τὸ πράον ἐπιεικὲς τοῦ αὐθάδους δικαλού προκρίνοντες.

⁶² Navarre, *op. cit.*, pp. 220 f.; Plutarch, *Mor.*, 814 c-d; and Schol. on Demosthenes, p. 574, 7 ff. (ed. Dindorf).

⁶³ See the readable essay of C. B. Gulick, "Notions of Humanity among the Greeks," *Harvard Essays on Classical Subjects* (1912), pp. 35-65. Grace H. Macurdy, *op. cit.*, n. 45, cites many passages and much bibliography. Cf. also W. L. Courtney, "Our Euripides the Human," *Fortnightly Review*, CIV (1918), p. 281; and M. N. Tod, *C. A. H.*, V, p. 9.

⁶⁴ Herodotus, VI, 21. Cf. *C. A. H.*, IV, pp. 168-72.

Xenophon imply that lugubrious manifestations on the part of an audience were the usual thing, not only at tragic dramas but also at recitations of epic poetry and at renditions of melic songs.⁶⁵ Athenian compassion is celebrated in Sophocles' *Oedipus Coloneus*,⁶⁶ and the sense of pity is recommended in a number of passages which will be considered under the third of the topics herein discussed.

The criticism of democracy implicit in Cleon's use of the topic appears also in Euripides' description of the Argive assembly whose fiery rage will burn itself out if one is careful not to fan it, but waits for a propitious moment: "A sense of pity have they and passion strong: priceless if one but wait and watch his chance."⁶⁷ Parrhasius included pity among the conflicting passions which he tried to represent in his portrait of the Athenian *Demos*.⁶⁸

Thus there were two sides to this topic too, and the assumed Athenian sense of pity might be a topic of praise or of blame. The negative side may be reflected in a number of passages in Greek drama in which the sense of pity is deprecated, often for reasons not unlike those which Plato urged against the emotion.⁶⁹ In Euripides' *Helena* Menelaus despairs to plead pitifully or shed a tear and coward-like shame his Trojan glory. He has heard, however, that to shed tears in misfortune is the part of a noble man, but he doubts it and will not prefer such a "fine thing" to bravery.⁷⁰ Young Neoptolemus is a little taken aback

⁶⁵ Plato, *Phil.*, 48 a, ". . . the tragic spectacles, when people enjoy weeping"; *Rep.*, 605 d; *Ion*, 535 e; *Leg.* 800 d; Xenophon, *Cyr.*, II, ii, 13.

⁶⁶ Lines 260-2 and 1125-7. Note in 1127 the application to Athens of the attribute *τούπιεικές*. The Scholiast on line 258 refers to Athens' reputation for being *φιλοικτήμων* (cf. *supra*, note 61) and *ἰκεταδόκος* and cites a fragment of Callimachus (*Aetia*, II, 4, *L. C. L.*): *οὐγεκεν οἰκτείρευν οἴδε μάνη πολίων*. Athens' Altar of Pity (Pausanias, I, 17, 1) may not have existed before the latter half of the third century before Christ.

⁶⁷ Euripides, *Or.*, 702 f.

⁶⁸ Pliny, *H. N.*, XXXV, 69. Cf. Frazer's *Pausanias*, II, pp. 27 f. Plutarch's description of the Athenian people at *Praecepta Ger. Reip.*, III, 4 f., offers parallels to Pliny's description of Parrhasius' painting.

⁶⁹ See my note, "Pity in Plato's Dialogues," *C. W.*, XXXV (1942), pp. 245 f. For Plato's depreciation of tears and lamentation as childish or effeminate cf. *Rep.*, 604 c; 605 d-e; 387 e-388 a; 398 e; *Leg.*, 949 b. In drama cf. Sophocles, *Ajax*, 317-20; *Tr.*, 1070-5; Euripides, *I. A.*, 446-53; *Ion*, 361; *I. T.*, 482-9; and *Or.*, 1022-48.

⁷⁰ Euripides, *Hel.*, 947-53. Euripides may be animadverting pointedly on the forensic *ἐλεευολογία* here. Cf. the fragment cited *infra*, note 80.

at the thought that he will be accused by his leader of being compassionate.⁷¹ The Achilles of the *Iphigenia in Aulis*, still the Homeric hero of straightforward character and all-absorbing devotion to honor,⁷² answers Clytemnestra's supplication with the promise that, having invested her with pity, he will show her so much compassion as befits a youthful hero.⁷³ Woman is more suited to arousing pity than man,⁷⁴ just as she is more compassionate.⁷⁵

In Euripides' *Medea* Creon's sense of pity brings calamity down upon his house. In banishing Medea, he had explained that he was but taking due precautions against a threat of hers that had come to his ears, inasmuch as he deemed it better to win her hatred at the moment than later to have cause to regret that he had been soft-hearted (287-91). He answers her impatient question, "Pay you no heed to supplications?" with the prognostic type of the banishment-of-pity topic: "No, for I love not you more than my home" (327). When at last he grants one of her prayers it is with much distrust of his wisdom in doing so (348 f.):

ἢκιστα τοῦμὸν λῆμ' ἔφυ τυραννικόν,
αἰδούμενος δὲ πολλὰ δὴ διέφθορα.

This counsel of caution became the specious excuse for unspeakable cruelty in the mouth of Lycus who in the *Hercules Furens* (165 f.) declares that his intent to kill the children of Heracles is not a policy of shameless cruelty (*ἀναδεῖα*) but one of circumspection (*εὐλάβεια*). His justification of his intentions is almost exactly that which Cleon urges upon the Athenian assembly. Lycus has already stained his hands with blood in the slaying

⁷¹ Sophocles, *Phil.*, 1074 f.

⁷² Cf. Euripides, *I. A.*, 927 with Homer, *Il.*, IX, 312 f.

⁷³ Euripides, *I. A.*, 933 f. For the interpretation cf. C. G. Firnhaber (Leipzig, 1841) on lines 924 ff. and 973 ff. Weil took the restrictive clause to refer to Achilles' lack of authority; C. E. S. Headlam (Cambridge, 1889) explains: "i. e., with my sword in the last resort." But Achilles is less compassionate than he is angry at the abuse of his name (938, 947) and at the insolence of Agamemnon (961). If only Agamemnon had asked his permission first (962)! He would not have refused (966 f.).

⁷⁴ Euripides, *I. T.*, 1054.

⁷⁵ Euripides, *H. F.*, 536. Cf. also Aeschylus, *Septem*, 182 ff., 656 f.; Sophocles, *Ajax*, 580; and my paper cited *supra*, note 19, p. 439.

of Creon, the children's grandfather. His only hope of security lies in shedding more blood, lest the avengers of Creon grow to maturity. Similarly Athens is the despot of an empire held by force alone. Her security is contingent upon her readiness to use more force, and use it drastically.⁷⁶

III

The third topic in Cleon's speech, his reference to the debilitating effect of the new sophistic rhetoric, is, like the topic of the praise of Athens, more inclusive than any particular commonplace of pity, and yet has a subordinate aspect which is just such a commonplace. The familiarity of the topic is perhaps indicated by the fact that Aristotle uses it to illustrate the *argumentum ex consequentibus* in his treatment of enthymemes.⁷⁷ The bad consequence of education is envy ($\tauὸ\phiθονεῖσθαι$), the good consequence wisdom ($\tauὸ\deltaὲ\sigmaοφὸν\epsilonἶναι$). It is therefore possible to argue in favor of or against education. Aristotle's language leads us directly to a passage in Euripides' *Medea* (294 ff.). The lines occur in Medea's appeal to Creon against his banishment of her, which, she implies, is the result among other things of the envy aroused by her reputation for learning. It has been conjectured that this passage of the *Medea* conveys a direct reference to Anaxagoras, but a comparison of the disadvantageous features of education which Medea lists here with the arguments used by the Attic orator to insinuate himself into the good graces of the juror suggests rather that we have in the *Medea* passage a direct reference to another topic of the *praeoccupatio benevolentiae*, one distinct from that discussed in relation to the commonplace of the praise of Athens. Navarre has discussed the topic fully and has collected many examples of protestations to the effect that the speaker is but an ordinary private citizen, ignorant as his judges.⁷⁸ In part at least the extreme frequency of such a stereotyped *praeoccupatio benevo-*

⁷⁶ Thucydides, III, 37, 2; 40, 7.

⁷⁷ Aristotle, *Rh.*, 1399 a 10-17. Aristotle says that this argument together with that of the possible and the others (i. e., other classes of commonplaces given at 1391 b 29 ff.) constitutes the entire *Art of Rhetoric* of Callippus, for whom cf. also *Rh.*, 1400 a 4 f. and Cope's commentary, II, pp. 271 and 285.

⁷⁸ Navarre, *op. cit.*, pp. 222-30.

lentiae owed itself to the law obliging a litigant to speak for himself. But there was also a definite feeling of hostility towards the sophists, a feeling of envy for their highly profitable calling. There is an appeal to this popular prejudice against the new learning in the *Bacchae*,⁷⁹ where with a glance at the impiety of Pentheus the chorus closes its hymn to Dionysus with the following assent to his religion: "The creeds and customs of the ordinary mass of mankind—these would I too accept."

The good consequence of education is that it brings wisdom which in turn brings considerateness, for, as Aristotle says, those who are educated are likely to feel compassion (*Rh.* 1385 b 27). This is of course implied in the topic of the praise of Athens, and the praise of the heliasts for their culture and compassion. But the idea that education refines one's sense of pity is found quite apart from the implication of the topic of praise. A fragment of Euripides, for example, declares that "not to shed tears at what is pitiable is boorishness (*ἀμονσία*)."⁸⁰ In the *Hercules Furens* Megara thanks the chorus of old men for their indignation in her behalf and for their valiant effort to protect her children from the violence of Lycus, but she advises them not to cherish any hope that they may be able to soften Lycus with words: "When your enemy is a common lout (*σκαλὸν*) you had best flee, and be compliant rather to the wise and those well-bred. For it is quite easy in dealing with these to touch their feelings of considerateness and strike up a friendly agreement."⁸¹ The same thought occurs, as commentators note, in the *Heracleidae*, where the aged suppliant Iolaus generously suggests that perhaps Athens might be able to save the children of Heracles by surrendering him, Iolaus, to Eurystheus to sate his cruelty on. "For," says Iolaus, "the man's a boor. Let wise men pray their enmities be with the wise, not with an ignorant dunce. Even so would one though ever so luckless find much mercy."⁸² The

⁷⁹ 430-3. Cf. also *Med.*, 1225-7.

⁸⁰ Frag. 407. The fragment continues with the philanthropic sentiment that those who have should share with those who have not. Cf. the passage cited *supra*, note 70.

⁸¹ Euripides, *H. F.*, 298-301, *O. C. T.* Cf. La Fontaine, *Fables*, viii, 10: "Rien n'est si dangereux qu'un ignorant ami; | Mieux vaudrait un sage ennemi."

⁸² Euripides, *Heracl.*, 458-60. At 460 I read πολλῆς γὰρ αἰδοῦς κάτυχῆς τις ἀν τύχοι. Cf. Méradier *ad loc.* in the "Budé" Euripides.

context of the *Heracleidae*, however, gives the sentiment a slightly different tone here. Iolaus had remarked in the play's prologue on the disadvantages of altruism (2-5), and upon the trouble he was going through because of his *aiδώς*, a word which is clarified in this instance by his later remark that he shrinks from betraying the children for fear of what people would say (28-30). Perhaps we are to understand at 458-60 that he is somewhat wistfully comparing his own dutiful character and the trouble it gets him into with the brash outrightness of a man like Eurystheus. Such a comparison is explicit in a fragment of Euripides' *Oedipus* (552) :

Πότερα γενέσθαι δῆτα χρησιμάτερον
συνετὸν ἀπολμον ἡ θρασύν τε κάμαθή;
τὸ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν σκαιόν, ἀλλ' ἀμύνεται,
τὸ δ' ἡσυχαῖον ἀργόν· ἐν δ' ἀμφοῖν νόσος.

The choice offered here brings us back to the bad consequence of education. The words *τὸ δ' ἡσυχαῖον ἀργόν* are the stock slur on the effect of culture in general and of the sophistic training in particular. Pericles, in his funeral speech, defends Athens pointedly on this criticism: *φιλοσοφοῦμεν ἄνευ μαλακίας*. And a few sentences further, after remarking upon the special Athenian facility for reflecting before acting without in any wise losing the spur to action,⁸³ he adds, in a sentence suggestive of the fragment of Euripides just quoted : *ὁ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀμαθία μὲν θράσος, λογισμὸς δὲ ὅκνον φέρει.*⁸⁴

Thus the bad consequences of education consist not only in a general softening but more especially in a weakening of the will to act. It is with reference to the irresoluteness which refinement of feeling induces in matters of great and terrible moment that, I think, a much discussed passage in Euripides' *Electra* is to be interpreted. After a long stichomythy between Orestes and Electra, Orestes, learning that his father has not received such honorable burial as was his due, cries out (290): "Alas, what a thing you tell me!" Then, because he fears lest his cry of pain may betray his identity, he offers a plausible explanation of his distress: "I am smitten, for men are touched to hear of

⁸³ Cf. Thucydides, I, 70, 2-3; I, 120, 5; and my paper cited *supra*, note 57, p. 117.

⁸⁴ Thucydides, II, 40, 1-3. Cf. also III, 82, 4: . . . τὸ πρὸς ἄπαν
ξυνετὸν ἐπὶ πᾶν ἀργόν.

woes even when they are not themselves intimately concerned.”⁸⁵ He then asks for more information—joyless but necessary—to convey to Electra’s brother, and reverts to his gnomic mood (294-6):

ἐνεστὶ δ' οἰκτος ἀμαθίᾳ μὲν οὐδαμοῦ,
σοφοῖσι δ' ἀνδρῶν· καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲ ἀξῆμιον
γνώμην ἔνειναι τοῖς σοφοῖς λίαν σοφήν.

To the break in the second line the thought is that of the passages cited from the *Hercules Furens* and the *Heracleidae*. J. T. Sheppard⁸⁶ has pointed out the dramatic purpose of the sentiment here with relation to Orestes’ exclamation at line 971: ὦ Φοῖβε, πολλήν γ’ ἀμαθίαν ἐθέσπισας. But it is the second half of the passages, from καὶ γὰρ to σοφήν that has drawn more attention. Hartung translated: “Ohne Schmerzen ist es nicht, | Dass höhere Einsicht Menschen über andre hebt”; and he illustrated this translation with a reference to the unhappiness attendant upon the possession of the poetical talent, the *Welt-schmerz* of the poets of his own day.⁸⁷ This interpretation has been adopted by Weil, Murray (“Men pay for too much wisdom with much pain”), Denniston (Oxford, 1939), and others. But surely the dramatic emphasis here is not upon the mental pain which the sense of pity brings with it but upon the paralysis of the will to act which the entertainment of the finer sentiments occasions, the sickly o’er with the pale cast of thought of the resolution which Orestes knows he must summon forth for the task he has in hand. For there is little dramatic reason for Orestes to philosophize upon the price in pain of his own refined

⁸⁵ Cf. Euripides, *I. A.*, 981-4 and Butcher, *Aristotle’s Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*⁴, p. 258.

⁸⁶ “The *Electra* of Euripides,” *C. R.*, XXXII (1918), pp. 140 f. On the notion that there is a relationship between this Euripidean or sophistic commonplace and the Socratic paradox that all wrong-doing is involuntary—a relationship affirmed by Starkie (“Euripides the Politician,” *Studies* [Dublin], IX [1920], p. 210), by L. Parmentier (in the “Budé” Euripides at *H. F.*, 298-301), and by Macurdy (*op. cit.*, p. 2), cf. my note cited *supra*, note 69.

⁸⁷ J. A. Hartung on Euripides, *El.*, 293 (edition of 1850). Gilbert Murray pointed to Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* for the problem of Orestes in the *Electra* (*The Classical Tradition in Poetry*, pp. 205 ff.), but so far as I know no one has suggested the interpretation offered here for lines 294 ff.

feelings. There is every reason for him to anticipate and struggle against the irresolution which is so dramatically portrayed in lines 964-87.

SUMMARY

Because of the limitations imposed upon this paper, it is not possible here to exploit all the suggestions latent in the material brought forward. It has seemed to me desirable first of all to analyze the topical content of the commonplace of pity occurring in Cleon's Mytilenean speech from the point of view of the ideas involved and their development rather than from that of the seeker of origins or the creator of hypotheses having to do with that much vexed question, the invention of rhetoric. Yet it may not be amiss to point out the bearing of this study upon some of the problems in the history of Attic rhetoric.

The topics of the appeal to pity and the banishment of pity are in a large sense really one topic. Just as the topic of probability was equally available to prosecutor and defendant from its first use,⁸⁸ so it would seem reasonable to suppose that the banishment-of-pity topic was available as soon as the appeal-to-pity topic. Both topics appear in Homer, but the former is somewhat more explicit than the latter. Instances of the appeal-to-pity topic in Sophocles' plays do not seem to owe anything to rhetorical formulation but seem rather to be a natural development of Greek feeling with respect to the mutability of mortal affairs. Nor does Aeschylus' use of the banishment-of-pity topic suggest that he is conscious of a rhetorical formulation. The appearance of the topic in Antiphon's early oration, *Against the Stepmother*, and the probability that both the appeal-to-pity and the banishment-of-pity topics appeared in their basic and their subordinate forms among the examples of *argumenta ad misericordiam* of which Thrasymachus' "Ελεοι presumably consisted, indicate a conscious formulation of these topics at some time between 450 and 440 B. C.

The type of the *praeoccupatio benevolentiae* which consisted in flattering the judges for their presumed humanity seems to have derived from the general panegyric of Athens which may

⁸⁸ See the admirable treatment of this subject by D. A. G. Hinks, "Tisias and Corax and the Invention of Rhetoric," *C. Q.*, XXXIV (1940), pp. 63-5.

be presumed to have been a feature of funeral orations and of symbouleutic addresses. The earliest identifiable form of this topic, the praise of Athens for her folly in extending her protection to states too weak to reciprocate in kind, appears not later than 430 B. C. and possibly as early as 445 B. C. As a forensic topic it belongs naturally to the *exordium*, as does the *miseratio* to the peroration, but there is no necessary relation between the use of these topics and the problem of the invention of the *partes orationis*.⁸⁹

The topic of the good and bad consequences of education is related to the foregoing topic, but is not so broadly political. The debate on the pros and cons of the new sophistic education probably began shortly after the influx into Athens of the new professors and took on certain formal characteristics with repeated treatment. The distinction between word and deed or between reflection and action is one uppermost in Greek thought and dates back to Homer.⁹⁰ The pretensions of the new professors, their mercenary calling, their advanced thinking on matters of religion and ethics, the confusion and absurdity to which an unskilled use of their *promptuaria rhetorica* lent itself—these and other such features of the new rhetoric served to throw into sharper contrast the progressive elements of Athenian culture and the fundamental conservatism of the man in the street or on the farm. Envy, Herodotus tells us (VII, 236), is a passion in which Greeks rejoice. The early advocate was quick to utilize this quality to his own advantage, to invent a formal appeal to the common man as opposed to the beneficiary of the new learning—as opposed, in fact, to his own class.

As the act is set off against the word, so is the speaker contrasted with the doer of deeds, and so is the center of high culture with the strictly military state, with the implication that the cultivation of the arts of deliberation, eloquence, and phi-

⁸⁹ See Hinks, *loc. cit.*, pp. 66-9. F. Solmsen ("The Orator's Playing upon the Feelings," *Class. Phil.*, XXXIII [1938], pp. 393 f.) makes overmuch of the circumstance that Aristotle does not happen to refer his discussion of the $\pi\alpha\theta\eta$ to any particular division of a speech, whereas the *Rhetoric to Alexander* often makes such a reference. Solmsen infers that Thrasymachus confined pathetic proofs to the epilogue, that Aristotle breaks with such a tradition, and that later rhetoricians are accordingly either Aristotelians or Thrasymacheans.

⁹⁰ Cf. my paper cited *supra*, note 57, pp. 104 f.

Iosophy tends to weaken the will to act. Thueydides was pre-occupied with this problem and represented Pericles as defending his city and its policy against any such implication. Euripides' treatment of this topic in his *Medea*, appearing, as it did, at the very beginning of the Peloponnesian War (431 B. C.), is near enough to that of Pericles' funeral speech to clear Thucydides of the charge of anachronism so far as the thought is concerned.⁹¹ The *Medea* would seem to contain the earliest explicit treatment of the topic in extant Greek literature.

Thus all three topics were common property by 431 B. C., perhaps somewhat earlier, and it is conceivable that Cleon really did weave them into his attack on the sentimental policy with regard to the disposition of the Mytileneans. It is, however, no more than conceivable, for the dramatic setting of the Mytilenean debate, the fact that all three topics gained greater definiteness through the fifth and into the fourth century before Christ, and Thucydides' preoccupation with the topics of the appeal to pity and the effect of the new education render it equally probable that he should have deliberately chosen the occasion of Cleon's speech for his extraordinary interweaving of the three topics. But it is not, as I have stated, the purpose of this paper to draw positive conclusions concerning the veracity or anachronism of Thucydides' report of Cleon's Mytilenean speech, but rather to present in detail a contribution to the history of the commonplace of pity, in the hope that the study of this and similar branches of commonplace may cast light upon the historical relation of ideas, or may at least guard us against finding significant parallels in ideas which were the common property of an age and a civilization.

EDWARD B. STEVENS.

DE PAUW UNIVERSITY.

⁹¹ Finley, *loc. cit.*, p. 66, arrives at this conclusion by a somewhat different method.

REPETITION OF LINES IN ARISTOPHANES.

The eleven comedies of Aristophanes contain fifty-five lines¹ repeated either exactly or with slight change in the same or another play. In modern literature extensive repetition is severely censured as unaesthetic; ancient literature likewise has suffered from this prejudice, and literary criticism has been quick to condemn and textual criticism prone to reject² a line, if it has occurred before, frequently disregarding the motive the writer may have had to justify such a repetition. In the case of Aristophanes, twelve such lines have been rejected,³ others criticized, and the intentional effect of others has passed unperceived. A study of his repetitions reveals that Aristophanes in most cases repeated himself deliberately and consciously, with a clearly discernible motive and purpose, the most obvious and natural being the desire to produce a comic effect, although other reasons for repetition are not excluded. This device indeed appears to be a familiar technic utilized by the poet to arouse laughter and to produce many other effects. Further, at least one passage is clear evidence that sheer convenience sometimes motivated the repetition. This passage is the description of Cleon which occurred in the parabasis of the *Vespae* (1030-7) and which he repeats again in similar circumstances in the *Pax* (752-60) with slight change. This borrowing (and there is no

¹ This does not include many parts of lines and expressions so extensive as to have about the same effect as complete lines. The very great majority of lines are repeated in the same play.

² Repetition in the three tragedians has been thoroughly studied (see p. 435, n. 1, of the reference below). Of the three, Euripides, whose plays contain by far the largest amount of repetition, has suffered most from the tendency to reject repeated lines. But Philip W. Harsh, "Repetition of Lines in Euripides," *Hermes*, LXXII (1937), pp. 435-49, has pointed out that most such lines are justified as deliberate dramatic devices used by the tragedian. Harsh mentions the occurrence of repetition in Aristophanes, and cites ten examples (p. 437 and n. 5).

³ By one editor or another. There is no unanimity at all in the treatment by editors of these lines, each of which is noted and discussed below. *Ran.* 1431-2 is unique—apparently one or the other of these lines must be rejected. This is one of the two cases in which some of the MSS themselves omit a repeated line. It is natural that Aristophanes should have fared better than Euripides in this matter.

evidence for later interpolation) is unique in Aristophanes both in its extent and in its lack of a discernible motive, save convenience. In order to show the extent of his repetition, and to indicate its motive wherever it can be discerned, I have collected all the examples of repetition in Aristophanes⁴ and arranged similar examples together, according to the purpose⁵ which motivated the repetition.

Two examples from the *Nubes* will illustrate Aristophanes' reason for one prominent type of repetition and his technic. Strepsiades, in his interview with Socrates, finding the philosopher aloft in the Phrontisterion, asks what he is doing. Socrates replies:

ἀεροβατῶ καὶ περιφρονῶ τὸν ἡλιον (225 = 1503).

Later, when Strepsiades, disillusioned, has set fire to the Phrontisterion, Socrates, rushing out, asks what he is doing. From above, Strepsiades answers, disparaging him, in his own words (1503).⁶

⁴ I have omitted those lines the repetition of which was demanded by the very nature of the action of the play, e. g., the oath of Lysistrata (212-36), where each part of the oath necessarily had to be repeated; the repetitions required in the contest between Aeschylus and Euripides in the *Ranae*, and lines such as *Pax* 1280-2. In such places, Aristophanes could not have avoided repeating. In contrast to these, the repetition of ληκύθιον ἀπάλεσεν and *Ranae* 1265, 1267, 1271, 1275, 1277 is a conscious device used to produce a comic effect. I have also omitted lyric refrains. The very great majority of repetitions occur in the iambics. Repetition is rather evenly distributed among the plays (most prominent in *Acharnenses* and *Nubes*) except that *Lysistrata* and *Thesmophoriazusae* show a striking avoidance of it.

⁵ I am aware that there is danger, in so subjective a matter, of being too acute in grasping the motive of a writer, and that this is especially true of Aristophanes, since there are frequently several motives operative at once, which should not be isolated from each other. But I have attempted always to identify the motive which most apparently prompted the repetition. In particular, it is usually certain whether or not a repetition was deliberate and conscious; and repetitions with strong comic force are generally easily recognizable. Besides motive, the criteria used are proximity and verbal similarity. It should be kept in mind that in oral presentation repetitions are more noticeable and the usual reasons for rejecting a repeated line thus less cogent, since the motive for the repetition would be more obvious.

⁶ It is perhaps scarcely necessary to point out that the repetition is not ordinarily the sole source of the comic effect, but that, in the case of

Again, when Pheidippides swears by Zeus, Strepsiades rebukes him, saying that Zeus is no longer king. Being asked who, then, is king, Strepsiades replies:

Δῖνος βασιλεύει τὸν Δῖνον ἔξεληλακώς (828 = 1471).

But later, when he is besought by his father, in Zeus' name, to help in obtaining vengeance upon Socrates, Pheidippides, unwilling, retorts upon his father his own words (1471).

Aristophanes' reason for the repetition in these two cases is the very apparent comic effect produced by the inversion of situation and speakers, the latter ironically mimicking the former and retorting upon him in derogation his own words. Other examples⁷ of repetition for this reason are:

Vesp. 959, 989⁸ κιθαρίζειν γάρ οὐκ ἐπίσταται
Vesp. 1191-2,⁹ Ἐφουδίων παγκράτιον Ἀσκώνδα καλῶς
 1383-4 ἢδη γέρων ὥν . . .
Vesp. 1411, 1446¹⁰ ὀλίγον μοι μέλει
Pax 1075 οὐ γάρ πω τοῦτο ἐστὶ φίλον μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν
 1106 ἀλλ' οὕπω τοῦτο ἐστὶ φίλον μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν
Pax 1076,¹¹ 1112 πρίν κεν λύκος οὖν ὑμεναιοῖ
Pax 1086 οὐδέποτ' ἂν θέλης λεῖον τὸν τραχὺν ἔχινον
 1114 οὐ γάρ ποιήσεις λεῖον τὸν τραχὺν ἔχινον
Av. 980 = 989 καὶ ταῦτα ἔνεστα; λαβὲ τὸ βιβλίον¹²

most of these lines, other sources of humor also are present. Here, e.g., *ἀεροβατῶ* is a comic coinage, *περιφρονῶ* supplies a jest *καθ' δμωνυμίαν*, the air of the line is absurdly tragic and bombastic. The comic effect arising from the repetition of the line under the circumstances described is independent of any additional sources of humor which may be present, but it is naturally intensified when they are present.

⁷ It has not seemed appropriate to discuss fully all the sources of humor in the lines repeated for one or another comic reason. Humor is, of course, subjective and largely irrational, and the precise manner of the application of this source of humor, its nature and extent, varies somewhat in the individual examples. It is naturally impossible to categorize the sources of humor with absolute precision.

⁸ Line 989 has the first person singular verb. The line is a proverb, of which another variation occurs in *Av.* 1432.

⁹ The repetition has a verb in the place of *παγκράτιον*. This verb occurs also in the first place, in line 1190.

¹⁰ Besides the special ironic repetition here, for mimicry, this expression, which is rather conventional, occurs seven other times in Aristophanes.

¹¹ 1076 is repeated also in 1077, with another effect, mentioned below.

¹² The latter part of the line occurs five times, providing a comic

Av. 1210, 1220 οὐκ οἶδα μὰ Δῖος ἔγωγε
Eccl. 1075 ὡς οὐκ ἀφῆσω σ' οὐδέποτ'. οὐδὲ μὴν ἔγώ
 1085 ἀλλ' οὐν ἀφῆσω μὰ Δία σ'. οὐδὲ μὴν ἔγώ
Pl. 302¹³ ἔγὼ δὲ τὴν Κίρκην γε τὴν τὰ φάρμακ' ἀνακυκῶσαν
 309 οὐκοῦν σε τὴν Κίρκην γε τὴν τὰ φάρμακ' ἀνακυκῶσαν
Pl. 918 = 929 ὁ βουλόμενος. οὐκοῦν ἐκεῖνός εἰμι ἔγώ

The following are essentially the same but vary slightly in the actual manner of repetition. Here again a second speaker repeats the words of the former speaker, but gives them a different application: the humor depends largely upon the immediacy of the contrast, which is the salient feature of these examples:

Ach. 1097¹⁴ παῖς παῖς φέρ' ἔξω δεῦρο τὸν γυλιὸν ἐμοὶ
 1098 παῖς παῖς φέρ' ἔξω δεῦρο τὴν κίστην ἐμοὶ¹⁵
Ach. 1134 ἐν τῷδε πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους θωρήξομαι
 1135 ἐν τῷδε πρὸς τοὺς συμπότας θωρήξομαι
Av. 1072, 1077¹⁵ ἦν ἀποκτείνη τις ὑμῶν . . .
Ran. 1134 ἔγὼ σιωπῶ τῷδε; Δι. ἐὰν πείθῃ γ' ἐμοὶ
 1229 ἔγὼ πρίωμαι τῷδε; Δι. ἐὰν πείθῃ γ' ἐμοὶ¹⁶
Eccl. 987-8 . . . κατὰ τὸν ἐν πεττοῖς νόμον

Other examples of this type: *Eq.* 997-8; 1090-2; *Eccl.* 448, 451; 460-1.

In five cases, the comic effect produced lies especially in the repetition of familiar lines either quoted or parodied from Tragedy.¹⁶ *Acharnenses* 384 = 436 is an illustration of this. Dicaearchus, on the point of beginning his speech in his behalf, asks the Acharnians to allow him "to array myself in most piteous wise" (384). Thereupon, visiting Euripides to obtain

refrain, resulting simply from the repetition: *Av.* 874, 976, 980, 986, 989. The beginning of each of these lines is similar in form, also.

¹³ These occur in lyrics, but the repetition is not simply a lyric refrain.

¹⁴ The entire passage of *Ach.* 1097-1142 consists of lines in which Dicaearchus disparagingly mimics Lamachus, exhibiting a rare and sustained parallelism of ideas, words, and rhythms. Besides the lines quoted, these are particularly similar in language: 1105-6; 1107-8; 1111-12; 1118-19; 1124-5; 1126-7; 1128-30; 1136-7; 1141-2.

¹⁵ The lines differ only in the proper names which are added. Suspensive points have been used to indicate only the omission of part of a grammatical unit, not parts of lines.

¹⁶ Again, the comic effect of such lines does not arise simply from the line's being quotation or parody but from its being repeated. Parody is an additional source of humor.

some "tragic rags" to make himself appear more miserable, he finally by his importunities secures from Euripides the "rags" of Telephus, and then tragically exclaims:

ὦ Ζεῦ διόπτα καὶ κατόπτα πανταχῆ,
ἐνσκενάσσασθαι μ' οἶον ἀθλιώτατον (384 = 436).¹⁷

The repetition of the line is not only natural but a source of humor. As many editors remark, it is parody or quotation from the *Telephus* of Euripides, as is practically the whole of the scene between Dicaearchus and Euripides.¹⁸ The line comes probably from the episode when Telephus puts on rags of a beggar as a disguise to gain admission to the palace. This seems to me undeniably a deliberate and conscious repetition by Aristophanes, the motive for which was the comic effect.

A somewhat similar case is *Acharnenses* 402, 408:¹⁹

ἔκκαλεσον αὐτόν. Κη. ἀλλ' ἀδύνατον. Δ. ἀλλ' ὅμως
ἀλλ' ἔκκυκλήθητ'. Εὐ. ἀλλ' ἀδύνατον. Δ. ἀλλ' ὅμως

Seeking an interview, Dicaearchus speaks first to the servant, then to Euripides, addressing to them the same lines. The line is repeated immediately especially to allow Dicaearchus to ridicule the tragic phrase *ἀλλ' ὅμως*, which was a favorite tag of Euripides (occurring, as Starkie says, 16 times in the extant dramas).

Ach. 574 τίς Γοργόν' ἐξήγειρεν ἐκ τοῦ σάγματος;
1181²⁰ καὶ Γοργόν' ἐξήγειρεν ἐκ τῆς ἀσπίδος

Line 574 is tragic parody spoken by Lamachus, and line 1181 is

¹⁷ All MSS have both lines. Valckenaer thought 384 spurious, and Elmsley bracketed it. 436 is rejected as an interpolation from 384 by Dobree, Dindorf, Mueller, Brunck, Meineke, v. Leeuwen, Rennie, and Starkie; it is retained as genuine by Elmsley, Bergk, Ribbeck, Blaydes, Clark, Elliott, Coulon, Rogers, and Hall-Geldart. The obvious humor of the line's repetition, since the motive for the repetition can be clearly discerned, justifies the retention of the line.

¹⁸ Cf. e.g., Starkie's edition on this point.

¹⁹ 408, found in all MSS, was thought spurious by Dobree, Meineke, v. Leeuwen. It is bracketed by Starkie. Much humor is lost if the line is not retained.

²⁰ Blaydes, Meineke, and Starkie, because of inconsistencies in the passage, bracket all of 1181-8 as the insertion of a late parodist, totally disregarding the comic effects of the passage.

a comic repetition by Lamachus' servant, echoing his master's words, after Lamachus' accident.

Ach. 578²¹ οὗτος σύ, τολμᾶς πτωχὸς ὅν λέγειν τάδε;
558 ταυτὶ σύ, τολμᾶς πτωχὸς ὅν ἡμᾶς λέγειν

As many editors point out,²² the line is quotation or parody from the *Telephus*. It is repeated here and, with further alteration, in 497 and 593, because it was undoubtedly familiar to the audience, and its use would elicit a laugh.

Ran. 100 = 311²³ αἰθέρα Διὸς δωμάτιον ἢ χρόνου πόδα

The line is made up of quotation or parody of Euripides' *Melanippe* (Frag. 487) and *Alexander* (Frag. 42), and *Bacchae* 889. The repetition permits Dionysus, with much lugubrious chagrin, to ridicule in the eyes of the audience Euripides' newly-created gods. The humor of the reversal of situation in which the repetition occurs is noticeable.

In a number of instances, a humorous effect arises merely because of the repetition of a line, usually by the same speaker. The exact comic force here would be difficult to describe and its intensity varies considerably, but from their humorous effect, proximity, and similarity of form, they appear unquestionably to be deliberate on the part of Aristophanes. Such is the effect of *ληκύθιον ἀπώλεσεν* and similar devices in the *Ranae* and the repetition of *λαβὲ τὸ βιβλίον* (974, 976, 980, 986, 989) when Peisthetaerus and the Oracle-Monger are examining the oracles in the *Aves*. Quite similar is the place in the *Ranae* where, during the long conversation between Dionysus and Heracles, Xanthias, his shoulder chafed by his burden, utters three times the complaining refrain: *περὶ ἐμοῦ δὲ οὐδεὶς λόγος* (87, 107, 115). The following are similar:

²¹ 578 was omitted by Valckenaer, Brunck, Meineke; substituted for 593 by Wilamowitz; bracketed by Starkie. The MSS contain all the lines.

²² Cf. the scholia on 497 and Starkie's notes on 558, 578, and 593. The repetition of *πτωχὸς ὅν* in these lines and elsewhere in the play becomes a *leit-motiv* or comic catchword (as Starkie on 497 points out) repeatedly recalling not only *Telephus* (in parody), Dicaearchus, but referring also to Aristophanes himself.

²³ Blaydes rejects 311, but quite wrongly. Some of the MSS and editions give the line to Xanthias instead of Dionysus. In this case, the repetition would permit Xanthias to mimic with irony the words of Dionysus. Partially repeated also in *Thes.* 272.

Ach. 596²⁴ ἀλλ' ἔξ ὅτου περ ὁ πόλεμος, στρατωνίδης
 597 σὺ δ' ἔξ ὅτου περ ὁ πόλεμος, μισθαρχίδης
Ach. 411, 413 οὐκ ἐτὸς χωλοὺς ποιεῖς
Eq. 96 — 114²⁵ τὸν νοῦν ἵν' ἄρδω καὶ λέγω τι δεξιόν
Eq. 120, 123 δὸς τὸ ποτήριον ταχύ
Nub. 113²⁶ = 883 τὸν κρείττον', ὅστις ἐστί, καὶ τὸν ἡττονά
Nub. 118 = 1250 οὐκ ἀν ἀποδοίην οὐδὲ ἀν ὁβολὸν οὐδενί²⁷
Vesp. 43 τὴν κεφαλὴν κόρακος ἔχων
 45 τὴν κεφαλὴν κόλακος ἔχει
Av. 789, 792, 796 αἴθις αὖ κατέπτετο
Av. 192²⁸ = 1218 δὰ τῆς πόλεως τῆς ἀλλοτρίας καὶ τοῦ χάους
Thes. 881, 884 ἔνδον ἐστ' ἡ ἔώπιος²⁹
Ran. 652, 658³⁰ δεῦρο πάλιν βαδιστέον
Ran. 1216, 1231 οὐχ ἔξει προσάψαι λήκυθον
Eccl. 25 ἔχουσι τοὺς πώγωνας οὓς εἱρητ³¹ ἔχειν
 68 ἔχετε δὲ τοὺς πώγωνας οὓς εἱρητ³¹ ἔχειν
Eccl. 826 κεύθυς κατεχρύσον πᾶς ἀνὴρ Εὐριπίδην
 829 πάλιν κατεπίττον πᾶς ἀνὴρ Εὐριπίδην
Eccl. 1053 τοῦτο γάρ ἐκείνου τὸ κακὸν ἔξωλέστερον
 1070 τοῦτ³² αὖ πολὺ τούτου τὸ κακὸν ἔξωλέστερον
Pl. 1002,³³ 1075 πάλαι ποτ³⁴ ἥσαν ἄλκιμοι Μιλήσιοι
Ach. 964,³¹ *Pax* 241 ὁ δενός, ὁ ταλαύρινος . . .

Other examples: *Ach.* 188, 191; 575, 1074; *Eq.* 623, 658; 657, 663; 1067, 1081; *Nub.* 160, 168; 1178, 1188; *Ran.* 623, 627; *Lys.* 986, 990; *Pl.* 1060, 1066.

In a large number of instances it is clear that Aristophanes repeated lines quite deliberately, desiring to produce some special effect (e. g., emphasis, insistence, reminiscence, characterization) other than the comic effect, though some humor also is not excluded from many of these examples. It is likely, too, that mere convenience played some part in the repetition of some few of these; it is difficult to judge such a matter with much finality,

²⁴ The rhyming endings of these lines makes the repetition more noticeable.

²⁵ 114 is bracketed by Wieland, Blaydes, and Kock, defended by v. Leeuwen and others; its retention is justified by the humorous effect of the repetition.

²⁶ 883 deleted by Dobree and Kock. The familiarity of the idea of this line would make its repetition especially comic.

²⁷ 192 deleted by Beck, followed by some editors.

²⁸ The fondness of Euripides for this word affects the comic force here.

²⁹ Cf., also, 656.

³⁰ The line was a proverb. Cf. Athenaeus, 523 F.

³¹ These adjectives were no doubt in *Pax* to recall the comic description of Lamachus in *Ach.*

since the mood of the writer cannot be recreated with absolute certainty. Thus, the following repetition, which is plainly intentional :

Ach. 623-5 . . . Πελοποννησίου

ἄπασι καὶ Μεγαρεῦσι καὶ Βοωτίοις

πωλεῖν ἀγοράζειν πρὸς ἐμέ, Λαμάχῳ δὲ μή

Ach. 720-2³² . . . ἀγοράζειν πᾶσι Πελοποννησίοις

ἔξεστι καὶ Μεγαρεῦσι καὶ Βοωτίοις

ἔφ' ώτε πωλεῖν πρὸς ἐμέ, Λαμάχῳ δὲ μή

The first passage is Dicaearchus' proclamation of his market-place, a proclamation which he proceeds to implement in the second passage, employing the same language. Similar are two passages in which an earlier warning or threat is found fulfilled :

Vesp. 429 τὰς χελώνας μακαριεῖν σε τοῦ δέρματος

1292 ἵνα χελῶναι μακάριαι τοῦ δέρματος

Pl. 138 οὐ βοῦν ἄν, οὐχὶ ψαιστόν, οὐκ ἄλλ' οὐδὲ ἔν

1115 οὐ ψαιστόν, οὐχὶ ιερεῖον, οὐκ ἄλλ' οὐδὲ ἔν

Slightly different is the next: here it is surely not by accident that Dicaearchus uses the same language as that earlier used by Amphitheus :

Ach. 52 σπονδὰς ποιεῖσθαι πρὸς Δακεδαιμονίους μόνῳ

131 σπονδὰς ποίησαι πρὸς Δακεδαιμονίους μόνῳ

Another type is the repetition of a line when the development of the story or action of the play presents a natural opportunity, though not a necessity, for the same language to be used again. Thus,

Av. 1534-5 . . . ἐὰν μὴ παραδιδῷ

τὸ σκῆπτρον δὲ Ζεὺς τοῖσιν ὅρνισιν πάλιν

Av. 1600-1 τὸ σκῆπτρον ἡμῖν τοῖσιν ὅρνισιν πάλιν

τὸν Δῖον ἀποδοῦναι.

The first passage is part of the advice given by Prometheus to Peisthetaerus as to the demands he should make upon the envoys sent by the gods; the second passage reveals him carrying out this advice in treating with Poseidon for peace. Similar are :

Ach. 202 ἄξω τὰ κατ' ἀγροὺς εἰσῶν Διονύσια

250 ἀγαγεῖν τυχηρῶς τὰ κατ' ἀγροὺς Διονύσια

³² 722 was deleted, quite wrongly, by Elmsley, as an interpolation from 625.

Ach. 318 ὑπὲρ ἐπιξήνου θελήσω τὴν κεφαλὴν ἔχων λέγειν
 355 ἐμοῦ θέλοντος ὑπὲρ ἐπιξήνου λέγειν
Nub. 378 εἰς ἀλλῆλας ἐμπίπτουσαι . . . παταγοῦσιν
 384 ἐμπιπτούσας εἰς ἀλλῆλας παταγεῖν
Nub. 803,³³ 843 ἀλλ' ἐπανάμεινόν μ' ὀδίγον εἰσελθὼν χρόνον
Pax 670 ἵθι νν ἄκουσον οἶον ἄρτι μ' ἥρετο
 679 ἔτι νῦν ἄκουσον οἶον ἄρτι μ' ἥρετο
Av. 203 ἀνεγέρας τὴν ἐμὴν ἀηδόνα
 208 κάνεγερε τὴν ἀηδόνα
Ran. 777, 789 ἀντελάβετο τοῦ θρόνου
Lys. 44 = 219³⁴ κροκωτοφοροῦσαι καὶ κεκαλλωπισμέναι
Pl. 260 = 281³⁵ ὅτον χάριν μ' ὁ δεσπότης ὁ σὸς κέκληκε δεῦρο
Pl. 968 ἀφ' οὐ γὰρ ὁ θεός οὗτος ἤρξατο βλέπειν
 1173 ἀφ' οὐ γὰρ ὁ Πλοῦτος οὗτος ἤρξατο βλέπειν
 1113-4 . . . ἀφ' οὐ γὰρ ἤρξατ' ἐξ ἀρχῆς βλέπειν
 ὁ Πλοῦτος,

In *Ach.* 515-16, the reiteration of *οὐχὶ τὴν πόλιν λέγω* is due to Dicaearchus' (i. e. Aristophanes') desire to make it clear with great emphasis that he is not attacking the State.

Other examples³⁶ of this class: *Eq.* 86-8; 336-8; 810, 820, 878. *Pax* 550-1; 1076-7. *Lys.* 40, 75. *Pl.* 237, 242.

The remainder of the repetitions mentioned in this account probably were not intentional on the part of Aristophanes. They are of several types, of which the first is the repetition of lines familiar to the poet and audience (e. g., as quotations, oracles, proverbs) and repeated merely because of this familiarity, not for some particular effect. For instance,

Eq. 813 = *Pl.* 601³⁷ ὡς πόλις "Αργους, κλύεθ' οἴα λέγειν

The line is quoted without reference to the context in either play, simply in fun. There was probably no connection between the two uses of this line by Aristophanes. In each instance, the

³³ The repetition differs in only one word. 803 is rejected by Kock as an interpolation from 843.

³⁴ 219 has singular number.

³⁵ 281 is omitted by R, V, and some editors. But the sense of the passage is incomplete without it, and its use characterizes the Chorus.

³⁶ A repetition of very unusual nature occurs in the *Eocl.* where, in a dialogue with the lines divided between two speakers, the second answers with the question (799): *ἢν δὲ μὴ κομίσωσι, τί;* this repartee, retaining the same form, with change of verb only, recurs in 799, 800, 801, 802, 803 and again in 862, 863, 864.

³⁷ From the *Telephus* and *Medea* of Euripides.

line is comic, but there is no comic effect in the repetition. The following occurred for the same reason:

Av. 948,³⁸ *Ach.* 465 ἀπελθε τουτοὶ λαβών· ἀπέρχομαι
Vesp. 1081,³⁹ *Pax* 357 . . . σὺν δόρει σὺν ἀσπίδι
Av. 978,⁴⁰ *Frag.* 230, αἰετὸς ἐν νεφέλῃσι γενήσεαι
 cf. *Av.* 987, *Eq.* 1013
Eq. 603, *Nub.* 1298 οὐκ ἔλας ὡς σαμφόρα
Eq. 673,⁴¹ *Lys.* 129, 130 ἀλλ' ὁ πόλεμος ἐρπέτω
Pax 1060, *Av.* 1705, ἡ γλῶττα χωρὶς τέμνεται
 cf. *Pl.* 1110
Nub. 1273⁴² τί δῆτα ληρεῖς ὕσπερ ἀπ' ὄνου κατατεσών;
Vesp. 1370 τί ταῦτα ληρεῖς ὕσπερ ἀπὸ τύμβου πεσόν
 Cf. also *Ach.* 110⁴³ and *Thes.* 626; *Eq.* 277 and *Thes.* 94.

There are further a number of places which, in the absence of any discernible special motive or purpose, we must judge to have assumed remarkable similarity through unconscious iteration or reminiscence on the part of the poet. Some may be indeed totally accidental repetitions. The content in some of these instances is not extremely significant; even so, it is striking that lines in plays composed several years apart should be verbally so similar.

Ach. 269-70 πραγμάτων τε καὶ μαχῶν . . . ἀπαλλαγεῖς
Pax 293 ἀπαλλαγεῖσι πραγμάτων τε καὶ μαχῶν
Ach. 1019 = *Nub.* 1263 ἀνὴρ κακοδαίμων. κατὰ σεαυτόν νν
 τρέπον
Eq. 155 = *Pax* 886 ἄγε δὴ σὺ κατάθου πρῶτα τὰ σκεύη χαμαί
Nub. 98, *Thes.* 937 ἀργύριον ἦν τις διδῷ
Nub. 432 ἐν τῷ δῆμῳ γνώμας οὐδεὶς νικήσει
Vesp. 594 κανὸν τῷ δῆμῳ γνώμην οὐδεὶς πώποτ' ἐνίκησεν
Nub. 698⁴⁴ = *Vesp.* 1166 οὐκ ἔστι παρὰ ταῦτ' ἄλλα. κακοδαίμων
 ἔγω
Nub. 814⁴⁵ = *Vesp.* 1442 οὗτοι μὰ τὴν 'Ομίχλην ἔτ' ἐνταυθοῖ
 μενεῖς

³⁸ From the *Telephus*. Cf. Nauck, *Mélanges*, III, p. 55.

³⁹ From the *Momus* of Achaeus.

⁴⁰ From a well-known oracle. The repetition of *Av.* 978 in *Av.* 987 (not exact) is for the comic effect.

⁴¹ As *Eq.* 673 shows, this was a familiar expression.

⁴² A proverb.

⁴³ Cf. Starkie's note on *Ach.* 110.

⁴⁴ First part repeated also in *Pax* 110.

⁴⁵ Very similar also in *Thes.* 224.

Nub. 2 ὡς Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ, τὸ χρῆμα τῶν νυκτῶν ὅσον
Ran. 1278 ὡς Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ, τὸ χρῆμα τῶν κόπων ὅσον

Nub. 1495 ἄνθρωπε, τί ποιεῖς; ὅτι ποιῶ; τί δ' ἄλλο γ' ἢ
Ran. 198 οὗτος τί ποιεῖς; ὅτι ποιῶ; τί δ' ἄλλο γ' ἢ

Pax 183⁴⁶ — *Ran.* 466 καὶ μιαρὲ καὶ παμμίαρε καὶ μιαρώτατε

Pax 535, Frag. 387 προβατίων βληχωμένων

Pl. 293 βληχώμενοί τε προβατίων

Av. 226 οὐποψί μελῳδεῖν αὖ παρασκευάζεται

Thes. 99 σίγα· μελῳδεῖν γὰρ παρασκευάζεται

Lys. 939⁴⁷ — *Eccl.* 981 ιὴ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ἦν τε βούλῃ γ' ἦν τε μῆ

Ran. 103, 751 μᾶλλὰ πλεῖν ἥ μαίνομαι

Ran. 202, 524 οὐ μὴ φλυαρήσεις ἔχων

Cf., also, *Eq.* 151, 172; 1323, 27. *Vesp.* 811, *Pax* 949. *Nub.* 1305-6, 1463-4. *Av.* 254, 1394; 1032, 1258. *Thes.* 360, 366; 948, 1151. *Eccl.* 18, 59. *Pl.* 491, 496; 433, 947.

HAROLD W. MILLER.

FURMAN UNIVERSITY.

⁴⁶ *Pax* 182 is also very similar to *Ran.* 465.

⁴⁷ Cf. also *Eccl.* 1097, *Lys.* 1036.

THE VERNACULAR PROVERB IN MEDIAEVAL LATIN PROSE.*

I

Thirty years ago, J. Werner¹ stated that, although a considerable number of mediaeval vernacular writers had been investigated as to their use of proverbs, little had been done in this respect concerning the Latin literature of the Middle Ages. Evidently, research in the last thirty years made no effort to fill up the lacuna, for in 1939, the Committee on Proverbs of the Group Comparative Literature II of the Modern Language Association of America reported² that "a collection of mediaeval Latin proverbs is an urgent necessity," and two years later, R. Jente in an exhaustive account of "Proverb Literature"³ found that "the mediaeval Latin proverb . . . represents a field that has been quite neglected and one which should yield valuable results of the history of many European countries."

The fact that mediaeval Latin writers used proverbs in their works is known well enough, and it is no less well known that mediaeval preachers liked to embellish their Latin sermons with vernacular proverbs. Scattered citations from sermons, and, less frequently, from other mediaeval Latin prose, found their way into studies on the proverb. The important collections of metrical versions of folk proverbs are accessible in good, modern editions.⁴ But the compilation of a *corpus* of mediaeval Latin proverbs will be a herculean task since many, even important, texts are available only in philologically unsatisfactory editions,⁵ and a vast amount of valuable manuscript material is still waiting for publication.

Indeed, a large assemblage of mediaeval proverb lore seems to

* Professor Steiner's untimely death prevented him from making a final revision of the proof of this article.

¹ "Lateinische Sprichwörter und Sinnsprüche des Mittelalters," *Sammlung mittellateinischer Texte*, III (Heidelberg, 1912), p. iv.

² *Modern Language Forum*, XXIV (1939), p. 59.

³ *Corona, Studies in Celebration of the Eightieth Birthday of Samuel Singer* (Durham, N. C., 1941), p. 38.

⁴ Cf. F. Seiler, "Deutsche Sprichwörterkunde," *Handbuch des deutschen Unterrichts*, IV, iii (München, 1922), pp. 71 ff.

⁵ Cf. K. Strecker, *Einführung in das Mittellatein* (2nd ed., Berlin, 1929), p. 5.

have escaped the attention of parœmiologists almost entirely: B. Hauréau, in the six volumes of his *Notices et Extraits de quelques manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 1890-1893), called attention to a number of proverbs in Latin and French in twelfth- and thirteenth-century sermons and tracts. Unfortunately, Hauréau, with all his admirable knowledge of mediaeval letters, examined the manuscripts, on the one hand, too hastily, and quoted from them, on the other hand, at random and repetitiously. Moreover, the six volumes of the *Notices et Extraits* have no index, and thus he would render great service to mediaevalists who would undertake the preparation of an index for this invaluable work.

Hauréau was prejudiced concerning the preachers of the thirteenth century. Commenting on the wealth of proverb material and gallicisms in these sermons, he ascribed this macaronic style repeatedly⁶ to a general decline of taste and to the deterioration of Latin in the thirteenth century. True enough, by and large, the Latin style of thirteenth-century writers meant no improvement on that of the twelfth. But Hauréau failed to notice that the twelfth century, whatever Renaissance tendencies it may have had otherwise, did not materially differ from its successor in its liking for proverb material. One of the greatest preachers of all times, St. Bernard of Clairvaux, gave the key-note in this respect, referring to vernacular proverbs and proverbial sayings not only in his sermons but also in his tracts and letters. Characteristically, he used a vernacular proverb, *Qui hoc facit quod nemo mirantur omnes*, which according to his biographers was a favorite saying of his, in the famous treatise *De Consideratione*, which, written between 1149 and 1152 or 1153 for Eugenius III, became "the manual, the *livre de chevet* of the Popes."⁷ Not only the preachers of the twelfth century, however, but also the historians, story-tellers, jurists, and philosophers made use of vernacular proverbs. In the following little collection, names of the best known writers of that period will recur, such as John of Salisbury, Peter of Blois, Walter Map, Andreas Capellanus, etc.

These vernacular proverbs gave rise to a memorable argument between Hauréau and A. Lecoy de la Marche concerning the

⁶ *Op. cit.*, III, p. 44; III, p. 154, *et passim*.

⁷ E. Vacandard, *Vie de Saint Bernard* (Paris, 1927), II, p. 491.

original language of the mediaeval sermon. Hauréau was of the opinion that the sermons were written and delivered in Latin whereas Lecoy de la Marche⁸ with weighty historical data supported his thesis that the sermons were originally composed in Latin but were delivered in the vernacular. For decades, Lecoy de la Marche's thesis was universally endorsed by students of mediaeval literature⁹ until A. Piaget reopened the question, pointing out, among other things, that "gallicised Latin or Latinized French is not characteristic of the sermons, and that it is found, perfectly authentic, in many other works of the Middle Ages."¹⁰

Plainly, the study of these proverbs is valuable not only to the paremiologist but also to the student of literature. From an Italian proverb in the *Liber de Moribus Hominum et Officiis Nobilium super Ludo Scacchorum*, F. Vetter concluded that its author, Jacopo de Cessolis, was an Italian. But Vetter himself found a French variant of this proverb (No. 288), which, even though still existing in modern Italian, turns out to be an authentic Old French proverb; thus, the argument would remain inconclusive if other documents had not helped to determine Jacopo's nationality.¹¹ Some editors were unable to identify the adages occurring in the texts as folk proverbs¹² and were wondering from where their authors "borrowed" a "citation." At times, proverbial sayings were misinterpreted,¹³ and, indeed,

⁸ *La Chaire française au moyen âge, spécialement au XIII^e siècle* (2nd ed., Paris, 1886).

⁹ It still appears in L. R. Lind, "Medieval Latin Studies: Their Nature and Possibilities," *University of Kansas Publications, Humanistic Studies*, XXVI (1941), p. 16.

¹⁰ L. Petit de Julleville, ed., *Histoire de la Langue et de la Littérature française des Origines à 1900* (Paris, n. d.), II, p. 227.

¹¹ F. Novati, "Una data certa per la biografia di Frate J. de Cessulis," *Il Libro e la Stampa*, III (1909), pp. 45 ff.

¹² E. g. H. Hagenmeyer in his edition of Fulcher of Chartres' *Historia Hierosolymitana* (Heidelberg, 1913), pp. 561, 755, 801, 806.

¹³ E. g. F. Chambon in his edition of Robert de Sorbon's *De Conscientia et De Tribus Dietis* (Paris, 1902), p. 26, interprets "ponere subtus baneum" with *se taire, renoncer à parler*, whereas it really is a phrase attributed to the dying minstrel in the *Danse Macabre* (cf. F. Neri, *Le Poesie di François Villon* [Torino, 1923], p. 77); L. Dimier, *Oeuvres complètes de Villon* (Paris, 1927), p. 123, paraphrases it with *cesser de jouer, se retirer de la scène*.

many an allusion of the Latin text will be lost unless the folk proverb, hidden in the background, is clearly understood.¹⁴

The vernacular proverb must often have migrated¹⁵ through the medium of these Latin translations. An English writer of the twelfth century quotes a Teutonic proverbial phrase in the original together with its Latin translation (No. 269). A Frenchman of the early thirteenth century gives a new Latin version of a proverb (Nos. 233 and 279) which, although quoted in French, was thought to have been current only in Anglo-Norman territory.¹⁶ A fourteenth-century French writer uses a Lombard proverb (No. 50), and a Florentine of the same period cites an "apt" French saying (No. 141). Italians who lived in France, like Fra Salimbene or St. Bonaventure, bring home the knowledge of French proverbs (Nos. 21, 157 b), and a great Catalan preacher, St. Vincent Ferrer, who lived and extensively traveled in France and Italy, draws upon French and Italian proverbs besides those of his native vernacular. Thus, we witness here the living process through which these proverbs were disseminated from land to land and came into that universal use which Seiler¹⁷ called *gemeinmittelalterlich*.

The history of many a proverb may also have to be revised. While Morawski had called attention to the fact that proverbs met with in didactic poems and in informal sermons of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were often recorded as late as the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Taylor¹⁸ rightly pointed out that the vernacular proverb frequently appears earlier in a Latin text than in the well-known and numerous collections of vernacular proverbs. Hence, many a proverb listed in Le Roux de Lincy's or Apperson's standard manuals can be assigned a much earlier date than the one found there.

An interesting example is offered by the much-quoted German proverb, *Junger Engel alter Teufel*, which Seiler (*op. cit.*, p. 93)

¹⁴ No. 140, under the disguise of an Ovidian passage (*Met.*, II, 846), alludes to a vernacular proverb; No. 175 translates O. F. *condescendre de franc pié*.

¹⁵ On the migration of the proverb, cf. A. Taylor, *The Proverb* (Cambridge, Mass., 1931), pp. 43 ff.

¹⁶ J. Morawski, "Les Recueils d'anciens proverbes français analysés et classés," *Romania*, XLVIII (1922), p. 494.

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 82.

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 51.

classifies as one of German origin. It first occurs, in Latin, about 1247-1249 in Vincent of Beauvais' *De Eruditione Filiorum Nobilium* (No. 48 a) and was used by John Gerson in a form literally corresponding to the German proverb; it was also quoted by the latter in a metrical version known from J. Werner's collection. This proverb was known to Le Roux de Lincy only from the fifteenth century. *Wächst die Ehre spannenlang, so wächst die Torheit ellenlang* (Seiler, *op. cit.*, p. 92) is undoubtedly German in its present form; but Seiler retraces it to the mediaeval proverb, *Mutantur mores quando mutantur honores*, quoted as early as the twelfth century by Peter of Blois and Giraldus Cambrensis, with the explicit remark: *Vulgare est quod . . .* (No. 83). Commenting on *Wer hangt, der langt*, Seiler (*op. cit.*, p. 94) quotes from Voigt's notes on Egbert's *Fecunda Ratis* a proverb occurring in a "mediaeval" sermon and does not notice that the author of the sermon was Guerric of Igny, a French contemporary of Bernard of Clairvaux. *Viel Körner machen einen Haufen* goes back, according to Seiler (*op. cit.*, p. 96), to the pentameter *Ex multis minimis grandis acervus erit*, appearing in Wright's *Latin Stories*; but Wright took his selections mostly from Anglo-Norman writers, chiefly from Odo of Cheriton, and all doubt is removed when the same verse crops up in Jacques de Vitry, the famous thirteenth-century French preacher (No. 63). Other proverbs which Seiler probably wrongly assumed to have been of German origin are: *Angst macht den Alten laufen* (No. 272), *Jeder strecke sich nach seiner Decke* (No. 131), *Wenn das Ferkel träumt, so ist es von Trebern* (No. 297), *Ein jeder Pfaffe lobt sein Heiligtum* (No. 165), *Wer zu viel haben will, dem wird zu wenig* (No. 213). In addition, the category called *gemeinmittelalterlich* will need revision also.

In this connection, attention must be called to a noteworthy group of Old Spanish proverbs, recently published by Américo Castro.¹⁹ The collection, entitled *Apéndice al Glosario de El Escorial*, compiled in the fifteenth century, contains a good deal of miscellaneous material, riddles, maxims, and apophthegms,

¹⁹ "Glosarios Latino-Españoles de la Edad Media," *Revista de Filología Española*, Anejo XXII (1936), pp. 133 ff. Professor Leo Spitzer of The Johns Hopkins University has kindly called my attention to this important publication.

alongside genuine folk proverbs, mostly in Latin, a number of which, however, also appear in the Spanish original. While many of these proverbs belong only to the Hispanic field, none of the Hispanic proverbs contained in the present collection can be found in it.²⁰ In addition to the purely Hispanic material, however, the *Apéndice* includes a great deal of Old French proverb lore, which its editor retraced only to J. Werner's above-named collection, and some of which, with slight variations, also appears in the present collection: *Bene scit murilegus cuius genobodium lambit* (*Ap.* 137) is here No. 285; *Dum caput aegrotat, cetera membra dolent* (*Ap.* 277) is No. 231 (No. 39); *Quien todo lo quiere, todo lo pierde. Omnia qui quaerit, omnibus orbus erit* (*Ap.* 197) is No. 213; *Qual es Maria, tal casa mantiene. Qualis est Maria, talis est in regimine domus* (*Ap.* 200) is No. 189; *El mur que non sabe mas de un forado, priado lo caza el gato. Mus miser est antro qui solo conditur uno* (*Ap.* 193) is Appendix No. 9; *Qual palabra dicen, tal corazon ponen. Qualis sermo ostenditur, talis animus approbatur* (*Ap.* 164) is No. 223; *Quan luenne de ojos, tan luenne de corazon. Qui procul est oculis, procul est a lumine cordis* (*Ap.* 165) is Appendix No. 16; *Non de ponte cadit, qui cum sapientia vadit* (*Ap.* 302) literally agrees with a proverb quoted by Morawski from a much older French sermon.²¹

In view of the fact that the word "proverb" had as vague a meaning in the Middle Ages²² as it still has at present,²³ this writer has taken certain precautions so that only genuine folk proverbs, vernacular proverbial sayings, idioms, and phrases should be included in the following collection. Citations from ancient or mediaeval literature, unless unmistakably pointing to

²⁰ This writer has been unable to locate any of the Hispanic items of the present collection in Haller's, Sbarbi's, or F. Rodríguez Marín's collections of Spanish proverbs. It may be found interesting that No. 40, a proverb quoted by Dante, seems to agree literally only with an Old Spanish proverb: *A quien Dios se la da: san Pedro se la bendiga* (J. Haller, *Altspanische Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche Redensarten aus dem Zeiten vor Cervantes* [Regensburg, 1883], I, p. 339, No. 279).

²¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 497.

²² *Op. cit.*, p. 482.

²³ Cf. B. J. Whiting, "Some Current Meanings of 'Proverbial,'" *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, XVI (1934), pp. 229 ff.

a vernacular proverb, are omitted.²⁴ The safest criterion is, of course, the express statement: *ut vulgo*, or *communiter*, or *vulgariter dicitur*; other formulas of the same nature are: *commune* or *tritum* or *rusticanum proverbium est*, or *ut vulgus loquitur*, etc. Another, less safe, criterion is offered when a proverb can be located in collections of vernacular proverbs such as those of Le Roux de Lincy, Düringsfeld, Morawski, Giusti, Apperson, Haller, Sbarbí, Wander, etc. These manuals are by no means complete as has already been noted concerning the Spanish.²⁵ No. 232, e. g., could not be located in any large collection but was finally found in B. J. Whiting, "Proverbs in the Writings of Jean Froissart," *Speculum*, X (1935), p. 297, No. 34. Finally some proverbial sayings betray their provenience by their form, linguistic or otherwise, e. g. No. 234.

Since mediaeval Latin writers, in translating these proverbs into Latin, closely followed the vernacular, these crude and at times macaronic versions will be of interest also to the student of historical grammar: they bring out characteristic traits of French syntax at an early date (e. g. No. 203) or will draw attention to idiomatic expressions of the old language for which one looks in vain in dictionaries of Old French (e. g. Nos. 31, 60, 123, 162, 167, 182). Ever since the twelfth century, the vernacular original, too, was occasionally quoted, with or without the Latin version. From Hauréau's excerpts, only the Latin and Latin-vernacular proverbs were taken over in the following list, and no exhaustive treatment of any author is claimed here. An effort has been made to gather all the vernacular proverbs, proverbial sayings, and phrases in some authors, e. g. in St. Bernard, but the collection is rather a *florilegium* than anything else, a modest start which, it is hoped, will be continued by many other students. Still, the little anthology will demonstrate that the vernacular proverb was an essential trait of mediaeval Latin prose. Its use was not rooted either in ignorance or in a lack of good taste, as Hauréau would have it in the case of the thirteenth

²⁴ Instructive for the history of the proverb is what Odo de Deuil, writing before 1162 of the Crusade of Louis VII, says: "Nevertheless, the ancient proverb, *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*, continued frequently to be repeated among us, even by some laymen" (Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, 185, 1212 A).

²⁵ R. Jente, *op. cit.*, p. 34, says: ". . . we still lack a convenient and reliable comprehensive work on the Spanish proverb."

century, since in most instances the writers consciously refer to the wisdom of the common people. The practice was not stopped by the Renaissance either. Dante's mediaevalism appears in the use of vernacular proverbs in his Latin writings (Nos. 40, 139, 169). Petrarch held the proverbs of the common people in high respect²⁶ although no example of his actually using them is known to this writer. Ciceronianism naturally prohibited the "barbarous" practice, but the humanists, especially those of the late fourteenth century, continued it in their private correspondence.²⁷ For the sake of the comical element, Poggio copiously used vernacular proverbs in his *Facetiae* (finished after 1453).

The greatest literary pasticcio of all times, the *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum*, was fully cognizant of this important element in mediaeval Latin style, and imitated it accordingly: more than a score of vernacular proverbs and proverbial sayings underline the mediaevalism of the Obscure Men. Indeed, in many a respect, critics of the style of the *Epistolae*²⁸ exaggerated the would-be ignorance of the pretended authors: some writers of the thirteenth century, men of undoubted scholarship and wide horizon, a William of Auvergne or a Fra Salimbene, neither wrote nor cared to write any better Latin than the one practiced by Crotus Rubanus and Ulrich von Hutten in their satire. Since the present collection is intended to cover only the period from the early twelfth century to the early fifteenth, the proverbs in the *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum* are listed separately in an Appendix.

II

List of Abbreviations and Sources.

Ad Adam the Scot, † 1180

De Tripartito Tabernaculo, Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, 198

²⁶ "Qualia [i. e. proverbia] sunt innumerabilia, in sermone vulgari, quae vel horrens villicus, vel tremens anus, si enunciet interdum, ut mirari nos cogat & subsistere & repetiti verbi laudare sententiam, acumen, ornatum, vim, sonum, magnificentiam, brevitatem," etc. ("Rerum Memorandarum," III, iii, *Opera Omnia* [Basel, 1581], p. 458).

²⁷ P. Monnier, *Le Quattrocento* (Paris, 1908), I, p. 295.

²⁸ W. Brecht, "Die Verfasser der *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum*," *Quellen und Forschungen der germanischen Völker*, XCIII (Strassburg, 1904), pp. 94 ff.; A. Bömer, *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum* (Heidelberg, 1924), I, pp. 69 ff.

Al Alexander Neckam, 1157–1217
De Naturis Rerum, ed. Thos. Wright, London, 1863

An Andreas Capellanus
De Amore Libri Tres, ed. A. Pagès, Castello de la Plana, 1930
[1174–1186]

Be St. Bernard of Clairvaux, 1090–1153
Opera, Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, 182–185

Bo St. Bonaventure, 1221–1274
a, *Opera Omnia*, Quaracchi, 1898
b, *Dietae Salutis* [Pseudo-Bonaventure], *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1866, VIII

Bu Burchardus de Bellevaux, † 1163
Apologia de Barbis, ed. E. P. Goldschmidt, Cambridge, 1935

Cae Caesar of Heisterbach, † ca. 1240
“Die Wundergeschichten des Caesar von Heisterbach,” ed. A. Hilka, *Publikationen der Gesellschaft für Rheinische Geschichtskunde*, XLIII, Bonn, 1937

Co Coluccio Salutati, 1331–1406
“Epistolario,” ed. Fr. Novati, *Fonti per la Storia d'Italia*, Roma, 1891–1911

Da Dante Alighieri, 1265–1321
Opere Minori, ed. Pietro Fraticelli, 6th ed., Firenze, 1892, II

De *De Glorioso Rege Ludovico Ludovici Filio*, ed. A. Molinier, Paris, 1887 [1171–1173]

El Elinand of Froidmont, † 1237
Sermones, Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, 212

Et Etienne de Bourbon, † ca. 1261
Anecdotes historiques, Légendes et Apologues tirés du recueil inédit d'Etienne de Bourbon, ed. A. Lecoy de la Marche, Paris, 1877

Fl *Flores Historiarum*, ed. H. R. Luard, London, 1890 [ca. 1326]

Fu Fulcher of Chartres
Fulcheri Carnotensis Historia Hierosolymitana, ed. H. Hagenmeyer, Heidelberg, 1913 [1101–1127]

Ga Gaufridus of Clairvaux
S. Bernardi Vita Prima, Liber III, Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, 185 [ca. 1166]

Gi Giraldus Cambrensis, 1147–1223
Opera, ed. J. S. Brewer, London, 1861

Gr Gregorio di Catino, 1060–post 1132
“Il Chronicon Farfense di Gregorio di Catino,” ed. Ugo Balzani, *Fonti per la Storia d'Italia*, Roma, 1903

Gu Guerrie of Igny, † 1155
Sermones, Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, 185

Gui Guibert of Nogent
Histoire de sa vie, ed. G. Bourgin, Paris, 1907 [ca. 1115]

Guib Guibert of Tournai
“Le Traité Eruditio Regum et Principum de Guibert de Tournai O. F. M.,” ed. A. de Poorter, *Les Philosophes belges*, IX, Louvain, 1914 [1259]

Gut Gutbier, J., *Bruchstücke einer lateinischen mit französischen Sätzen gemischten Predigtsammlung aus dem Ende des XIII. oder Anfang des XIV. Jahrhunderts*, Halle a. S., 1908

Ha Hauréau, B., *Notices et Extraits de quelques manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris, 1890–1892

He Henry de Bracton
De Legibus et Consuetudinibus Angliae, ed. Sir Travers Twiss, London, 1878–1883 [1250–1256]

Ja Jacopo de Cessolis, *Liber de Moribus Hominum et Officiis Nobilium super Ludo Scacchorum* [ca. 1310]
“Das Schachzabelbuch Kunrats von Ammenhausen,” ed. F. Vetter, *Bibliothek älterer Schriftwerke der deutschen Schweiz*, Ergänzungsband, Frauenfeld, 1892

Jac Jacques de Vitry, † 1240
a, *The Exempla or Illustrative Stories from the Sermones Vulgares of Jacques de Vitry*, ed. Thos. F. Crane, London, 1890
b, “Die Exempla aus den Sermones feriales et communes des Jakob von Vitry,” ed. J. Greven, *Sammlung mittellateinischer Texte*, 9, Heidelberg, 1914
c, *Sermones in Epistolas ex Evangelia Dominicalia*, Venice, 1578

Jg John of Garlandia, ca. 1180–post 1252
“Poetria,” ed. G. Mari, *Romanische Forschungen*, XIII (1902)

Jge John Charlier Gerson, 1363–1429
a, *Opera*, Antwerp, 1706
b, *Johannis Carlerii dicti de Gersono De Laude Scriptorum Tractatus*, ed. J. S. Smith, Rouen, 1841
c, Ch. F. Ward, *The Epistles on the Romance of the Rose and Other Documents in the Debate*, U. of Chicago Diss., 1911

Js John de Sheppey, † 1360
L. Hervieux, *Les Fabulistes latins*, Paris, 2nd ed., 1893–1898, IV

Jsa John of Salisbury
a, *Policraticus*, ed. C. C. J. Webb, Oxford, 1909 [1159]
b, *Metalogicon*, ed. C. C. J. Webb, Oxford, 1929 [1159]

Jv John de Varennes
“Responsiones ad Capita Accusationum Quibus Impetebatur,”
Jge a, I [1396]

La Laurence of Spain
Fr. Gillmann, *Des Laurentius Hispanus Apparat zur Compilatio III auf der Staatlichen Bibliothek zu Bamberg*, Mainz, 1935

Le Lecoy de la Marche, A., *La Chaire française au moyen âge, spécialement au XIII^e siècle*, 2nd ed., Paris, 1886

Ma Matthew Paris, † 1259
Matthaei Parisiensis Chronica Majora, ed. H. R. Luard, London, 1872 f.

Mat Matthew of Vendôme
“Ars Versificatoria” [ante 1175], E. Faral, *Les Arts poétiques du XII^e et du XIII^e siècle*, Paris, 1923

May Mayno de Mayneri, † 1354
“Contemptus Sublimitatis” (“Dialogus Creaturarum”), “Die beiden ältesten Fabelbücher des Mittelalters,” ed. J. G. Th. Grässle, *Bibl. des Lit. Vereins in Stuttgart*, 148, Tübingen, 1880

Ni Nicolaus of Clairvaux, † 1176
Epistolae, Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, 196

Od Odo de Cheriton, first half of 13th century
Hervieux, *Les Fabulistes latins*, IV

Pa Peter d’Ailli, 1350–1420
a, *Sermones*, Jge a, I
b, P. Tschaackert, *Peter von Ailli*, Gotha, 1877, Appendix

Pb Peter of Blois, ca. 1135–post 1204
Opera Omnia, ed. nova, Paris, 1667

Pd Peter Dubois, † post 1308
De Recuperatione Terre Sancte, ed. Ch.-V. Langlois, Paris, 1891

Pv Peter of Vaux-Cernay, † post 1218
Historia Albigensis Haeresis, Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, 213

Ro Robert de Sorbon, † 1274
De Consciencia et de Tribus Dietis, ed. F. Chambon, Paris, 1902

Rog Roger of Waltham, † post 1339, ante 1341
W. P. Hotchkiss, *An Introduction to the “Compendium Morale” of Roger de Waltham*, U. of Chicago Diss., 1935

Rom Romulus Anglicus, 14th century
Hervieux, *Les Fabulistes latins*, II

Sa Fra Salimbene, 1221–1290
a, “Cronica Fratris Salimbene Ordinis Minorum,” ed. O. Holder-Egger, *Mon. Germ. Hist. Scriptorum*, XXXII, Hannover-Leipzig, 1913
b, *Chronica Fr. Salimbene Parmensis*, Parma, 1857

Su Suger
Vie de Louis le Gros, ed. A. Molinier, Paris, 1887 [ante 1145]

Ta *La Tabula Exemplorum secundum ordinem alphabeti, Recueil d’exempla compilé en France à la fin du XIII^e siècle*, Thèse complimentaire par J. Th. Welter, Paris-Toulouse, 1926

Th Thomas Waleys, *De Modo Componendi Sermones* [ca. 1350]
Th. M. Charland, O. P., *Artes Praedicandi, Contribution à l’histoire de la rhétorique au moyen âge*, Paris-Ottawa, 1936

Ve Vergerio, Pietro Paolo, 1370–1444
“Epistolario,” ed. L. Smith, *Fonti per la Storia d’Italia*, Roma, 1934

Vi Vincent of Beauvais
De Eruditione Filiorum Nobilium, ed. A. Steiner, Cambridge,
 Mass., 1938 [post 1247, ante 1249]

Vin St. Vincent Ferrer, 1357–1419
Sermones, Lyon, 1513

Wa Walter Map
 "De Nugis Curialium," ed. M. R. James, *Anecdota Oxoniensia*,
 Mediaeval and Modern Series, XIV, Oxford, 1914 [post 1180,
 ante 1193]

Wi William of Auvergne
 "De Moribus," *Opera Omnia*, Venice, 1591 [post 1217, ante
 1228]

Wj William of Jumiègue
Gesta Normannorum Ducum (Version of Ordericus Vitalis and
 Robert of Torigni), Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, 149 [ca. 1149]

Wp William Perrault, † 1275?
Summa Virtutum et Vitiorum, Basel, 1497

Wr Wright, Thos., *A Selection of Latin Stories from Manuscripts
 of the 13th and 14th Centuries*, London, 1842

Wri William de Rishanger, Chronicle [ca. 1267]
*The Chronicle of William de Rishanger of the Barons' War. The
 Miracles of Simon de Montfort*, ed. J. O. Halliwell, London, 1840

Wt William of Thierry, † ante 1153
Vita Prima Bernardi auctore Guillelmo, Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, 185

Wty William of Tyr
Rerum in Partibus Transmarinis Gestarum Historia, Migne,
Patr. Lat., 201 [ca. 1184]

D I. v. Düringsfeld und O. v. Reinsberg-Düringsfeld, *Sprichwörter
 der germanischen und romanischen Sprachen*, Leipzig, 1875

Giusti G. Giusti, *Raccolta di proverbi toscani*, pubblicata da G. Capponi,
 4th ed., Firenze, 1893

LR Le Roux de Lincy, *Le Livre des proverbes français*, 2nd ed.,
 Paris, 1859

M J. Morawski, "Proverbes français antérieurs au XV^e siècle,"
Les Classiques français du moyen âge, Paris, 1925

PL Migne, *Patrologiae Latinae Cursus Completus*

PR *Proverbes en Rimes*, ed. Grace Frank and Dorothy Miner,
 Baltimore, 1937

1. VERNACULAR PROVERBS IN LATIN.²⁹

1. /Proverbium illud:/ Ablue pecte canem canis est et permanet idem.
2. /Dici solet quod/ Advocati in morte linguam consueverunt amittere.
3. /Ut verissime et urbane dicatur in vulgus iam tritum proverbium, cum aliquis se nunquam commotum ira glorietur, et acutissimum responsum sit: ergo/ Aleam non lusisti.
4. Amicus necessitate probatur.
5. /Solet dici quod/ Amor absconditus est perditus.
6. /Proverbialiter solet dici:/ Animo cupienti nihil satis festinatur.
7. /Vulgo enim dicitur:/ Aqua turbida piscosior est.
8. /Prout dicitur:/ Beatus est dare quam accipere.
9. /Hunc dedecorat vulgi proverbium quo dicitur/ Bellus pravus /cum sit enerviter mollis habens in barba signum fortitudinis/.
10. /Vulgo dicitur bono filio:/ Benedicatur pater tuus et mater tua.
11. Bene iuvatur quem Dominus vult iuvare.
12. /Vetus proverbium est et veterum ore celebrata sententia:/ Beneficiorum memoria labilis est, iniuriarum vero tenax.
13. Bona interiora, sicut sunt virtutes vel gratia, non possunt auferri /ut vulgo dicitur/ nec vento, nec gelu.
14. /Communiter dicitur:/ Bona vita ducit ad bonam mortem.
15. /Dicitur quod/ Bonam dietam facit qui de fatuo se expedit.
16. /Communi utendum est proverbio:/ Boni postulatores bonos habeant abnegantes.
17. a, /Est vulgare proverbium:/ Bonum servat castellum, qui custodierit corpus suum.
b, /Vulgariter dicitur quod/ Bonum castrum custodit, qui corpus suum custodit.

1. Bu p. 91. M 1040. Cf. No. 173 2. Jac b p. 12 3. Co I, 60 4. *Be Epist.* (1133), PL 182, 320B. M 170 5. Sermon, Ha V, 286 6. Wty p. 403D 7. Pb p. 76B. M 924. Cf. No. 180 8. May p. 219 9. Bu p. 52 10. Bo b p. 279a 11. Wr p. 93. M 251 12. Ni p. 1608. M 1534 13. Bo b p. 293a 14. Sermon, Ha III, 130. M 471 15. Sermon, Ha IV, 159. M 276. Cf. No. 20 16. Jge a III, 959A. M 9 17. a, *Be Sermon,*

²⁹ The Latin spelling has been standardized in all the proverbs.

18. /Dictum est vulgariter quod/ Bonum est a divite pecuniam accipere, et non a pauperi.
19. /Vulgariter dicitur:/ Bonum forum trahit argentum de bursa.
20. /Vulgo dicitur quod/ Bonum opus facit qui de stulto se expedit.
21. /Gallici ridendo dicere consueverunt quod/ Bonum vinum debet habere triplex *b* et septem *f* ad hoc ut sit optimum et laude dignum./ Dicunt enim hoc modo ludendo:
 El vin bons et bels et blance
 Forte e fer e fin e framble,
 Fredo e fras e formijant./
22. /Illud vulgare:/ Bonus conservator par est bono conquisitori.
23. /Vulgariter dicitur:/ Bonus morcellus bonum rumorem portat stomacho.
24. /Vulgo dicitur quod/ Canis non vult socium in coquina.
25. Canis /ut vulgo aiunt/ defendit foenum quod non comedit.
26. /De me dici tritum vulgo proverbium possit:/ Canis qui Romam petit, idemque lupus redit.
27. /In proverbio vulgari censet/ capito se ratione etiam capitis solius toti trutae praeferendum esse.
28. /In proverbio dicitur:/ Capra tantum scalpit, quod male iacet in terra nuda.
29. /Communi proverbio dicitur:/
 Cerasa cum dominis non consulo mandere servis,
 tollunt matura, sed dimittunt tibi dura.
30. Cognoscite auctorem operis in opere.
31. /Haec est confessio vulpis, quae solet in Francia appellari/
 Confessio renardi.

PL 183, 418A and 700A; b, Wp p. 139A. M 270 18. Etienne de Langton († 1228), Sermon, Le p. 293 19. Wp p. 110Q; Sermons, Ha II, 193 and III, 103. M 291 20. Bo b [Appendix *Dietae Salutis*] p. 349b. M 276. Cf. No. 15 21. Sa pp. 218 f. 22. Jge a III, 411. M 1251 23. Ta p. XII. M 1860 24. Bo b p. 257a. M 382 25. Be *Epist.* (ca. 1125), PL 182, 516A; cf. Gi VIII, 251: "Proinde vehementius admirandum quoniam tanquam cani comparandus in foenili,"—"The dog in the manger" 26. Ve p. 212. M 1089 and 1869* 27. Al p. 152 28. Jac a p. 8, b p. 49. M 2297 29. May p. 160. D I, No. 376 30. Be *Epist.* (ca. 1140), PL 182, 538A. LR II, 143 31. Jac a p. 125 32. Jge a IV,

32. /Dicit commune proverbium,/ Consilium in proprio capite minime esse portandum.
33. /Qui habent, ut dici solet,/ Cor in coquina.
34. /Vulgariter dicitur quod/ Cor non mentitur.
35. /Ut in trito proverbio vulgo dicitur,/ Corvum opertus sum nunquam ad arce claustra de cetero redditum.
36. •Cras dabor (*sic!*), non hodie.
37. /Ut vulgo dicitur,/ Crassas sibi faciat barbas arvinam ructando.
38. Cucullus non facit monachum.
39. /Secundum antiquum proverbium,/ Cui caput infirmum, cetera membra dolent.
40. /Tritum proverbium:/ Cui Deus concedit, benedicat et Petrus.
41. /Vulgo dicitur:/ Cuius capilli cadunt, signum est quod amatur.
42. Cum Britonibus praestolor Arturum et Messiam cum Iudeis expecto.
43. /Vulgare proverbium:/ Cum videris rufum fidelem, da gloriam Deo.
44. /Iuxta quod vulgo proverbiatur,/ Cuncta volentia sunt levia et omnia nolentia gravia.
45. /Vulgo dicitur:/ Curialitas incognita est perdata.
46. /Vulgari proverbio dici solet:/ De alieno corio fierent larga corrigia.
47. /Vulgariter dicitur:/ De bono facto collum fractum.
48. a, /Proverbium quod vulgariter solet dici, sc./ De iuvene sancto diabolum senem fieri.
b, Ex iuvene angelo senex diabolus.
c, /Versus:/ Angelicus iuvenis senibus satanizat in annis.
49. /Numquid, ut vulgo dicitur,/ De una filia duos generos statuisti facere?

604C. Cf. No. 148 33. Jge a III, 954B 34. Et p. 136. M 437 35. Co I, 244. D I, No. 265 36. Sermon, Le p. 251 37. Bu p. 44 38. May p. 183. LR I, 36. Cf. No. 77 39. Fl I, 256. M 443. Cf. No. 231 40. Da *De Monarchia* II, ix, 8. D I, No. 629 41. Ta p. XII 42. Pb p. 55. "Il est attendu comme le Messie," Littré 43. Mat p. 166. Cf. LR II, 490, and H. Schrader, *Der Bilderschmuck der deutschen Sprache* (6th ed., Berlin, 1901), p. 213 44. Gr I, 115. Cf. D II, No. 699 45. Sermon, Ha III, 110. M 301 46. Wty p. 593C; Jac a p. 63. M 453 47. Sermon, Ha V, 37. M 463 48. a, Vi pp. 82, 83; b, Jge a III, 1034C; c, Jge a III, 1577C. M 509 49. Be Sermon, PL 183, 599A. M 1514

50. /Solet dici in Langobardorum proverbio quod/ Deus aufert sensum quibus vult.
 51. /Ut vulgari proverbio dicitur,/ Deus ille p[ro]ae ceteris colendus creditur, qui subvenit in praesenti.
 52. /Vulgariter dicitur quod/ Deus nunquam habuit amicum quem exponeret confusione.
 53. /Proverbialiter dici solet:/ Difficile est ut bono claudantur fine quae malo sunt inchoata principio.
 54. /Propterea dicitur:/ Domino non deficit occasio.
 55. a, /Vulgo dicitur:/ Domino omnes honores.
 b, Omnibus dominis omnes honores.
 56. /Iuxta illud vulgatum:/ Dubius in fide infidelis est.
 57. /Quod proverbio dicitur, quod/ Dum munire se quisque intendit signo crucis, interdum digito in ocellum offendit.
 58. /Vulgo dicitur:/ Duo grossi in uno sacco non possunt capi.
 59. Durum est contra stimulum calcitrare: quippe qui plurimum contra stimulum recalcitrat, se dupli laesione exacerbat.
 60. /Dicitur de illo qui fuit amicus et post fit inimicus:/ Eieci illum de calendario meo.
 61. /Licet in antiquo proverbio sit/ esse melius male facere quam nihil operari.
 62. /Ut in trito proverbio vulgo dicitur,/ Ex harundineto difficile potest exitus inveniri.
 63. Ex multis minimis grandis acervus erit.
 64. /Iuxta tritum proverbium/ Exsorbeat pulmentum qui confecit.
 65. Facientes de necessitate virtutem.
 66. /Vulgo dicitur quod/ Facies laeta valet unum ferculum.
 67. /Proverbium:/ Facile causam agit in iudicio qui sine adversa parte loquitur.

50. Jge a IV, 638C 51. Jsa a I, 221. M 283* 52. Sermon, Ha VI, 65
 53. Wty pp. 587D, 508D. D I, No. 100 54. May p. 194 55. a, El p. 572C; b, Jge a III, 955C. M 127 56. [pseudo-] Jge a IV, 864D
 57. Ve p. 394 58. Bo b p. 324a. M 611 59. Mat p. 190; Wri p. 7.
 M 622, 1873 60. Sermon, Ha IV, 138 61. Co III, 255 62. Co III, 191
 63. Wr p. 6; Jac a p. 35. D II, No. 554 64. Jge a III, 1480A 65. Wty p. 295D. LR II, 299 66. Sermon, Ha V, 288 67. Jge a III, 1559A

68. a, /Vulgariter dicitur quod/ Fames expellit lupum a nemore.
 b, Fames eicit lupum de nemore.

69. a, Familia Helliungi.
 b, Familia vel exercitus Herlequini.

70. /Vulgari proverbio dicitur:/ Familiaris dominus fatuum nutrit servum.

71. Ferrum callidum malleari debet.

72. a, /Vulgo dicitur quod/ Finis, non pugna coronat.
 b, Finis non pugnam coronat.

73. /Hinc est quod dicitur:/ Fortior est ars viribus.

74. /Vulgo dicitur:/ Fortis est qui prosternit; sed fortior est qui resurgit.

75. /Faciunt/ Gallum implutum.

76. Habet maculam in oculo et oculum in macula.

77. Habitus monachi monachum facit credere.

78. /Proinde et vulgari proverbio . . . in monachos huiusmodi invective et irrisorie dici solet:/ Hoc equidem nullatenus facerem; facilius in infernum vivus descenderem; quinimmo citius, etiam aequanimius, in claustrum carcerem denuo redirem.

79. Homine mortuo finiri bellum /pessimo proverbio persuadebunt/.

80. /Cum aliquis, ut rem quamlibet consequatur, pecuniam multam expendit vel labore plurimo fatigatur, sic de eo solet in vulgo narrari:/ Homo iste rem illam care plurimum comparavit; res tamen illa iure sibi nullo debetur.

81. Homo qui /ut vulgo dicitur/ festucam quaerit unde sibi eruat oculum.

68. Et p. 163; Bo b p. 271b. M 1000 69. a, Anecdote, Ha II, 325; b, Sermon, Ha II, 106. "La mesnie Hellequin." Both passages were unknown to M. Rühlemann, *Etymologie des Wortes harlequin und verwandter Wörter* (Halle a.S., 1912), and O. Driesen, "Der Ursprung des Harlekin," *Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte*, XXV (Berlin, 1914), who compiled lists of all references to harlequin in the Old French period. 70. Be Sermon, PL 183, 614D. M 1723. Cf. No. 187
 71. Ta p. XII. M 645 72. a, Bo b [Append.] p. 354b; b, Jac a p. 33. M 1002 73. Rom p. 633. LR II, 296 74. El p. 688D. M 1780 75. Ro p. 15. "Faire le coc en pelu" O. F. = "faire le suffisant" 76. Sermon, Le p. 251 77. Et p. 230. M 1053. Cf. No. 38 78. Gi IV, 37 79. Co II, 402. D II, No. 464 80. An p. 115 81. [pseudo-] Be, PL 184, 471B.

82. /Ira aufert homini seipsum, sicut vulgo dicitur quod/
Homo turbatus vel iratus non est in seipso.
83. /Vulgare est quod/ Honores mutant, aut potius monstrant
mores.
84. Iecit lapidem in horto eius.
85. /Vulgo dicitur:/ Ieiunus stomachus non est fastidiosus.
86. /Ut vulgo dici solet,/ Ignem in una portant manu, aquam
in altera.
87. /De talibus enim qui habent magnam gloriam dicitur
vulgariter:/ Ille habet magnas radices.
88. /Hinc est illud vulgatum:/ Imaginatio facit casum.
89. /Tritum est iam sermone proverbium:/ In anni curriculo
plus se expendisse reperit cupidus quam profusus.
90. In curia regis unusquisque est pro se.
91. /Commune dicterium:/ In cauda iacet venenum.
92. Infirmi quidem /ut vulgariter dicitur/ non furca sed
linteo sunt vertendi.
93. In moechia /ut vulgo dicitur/ lucratur (sc. diabolus) pro
peccato duos, imo tres, et interdum plures /sc. adulterum
et adulteram et vetulam quae procurat peccatum/.
94. In molendino siti moritur.
95. In regione caecorum rex est monoculus.
96. /De quo scribitur veraciter:/ Insequitur leviter filius
patris iter.
97. /Proverbium rusticani:/ Interdum buccam cochlear frus-
tratur apertam.
98. Inter malleum et incudem.
99. /De tali proverbium istud commune solet adduci et dici:/
Iste ad suos meditatur amores.
100. /Petis a foris/ Ligna in nemus ridicule devehenda; petit
/ut patrio utar proverbio/ a Minione limphas Arnus et
opulentus munus petit.

Cf. M 516 82. Bo b p. 255a 83. Pb p. 205; Gi I, 241. M 850 84. Sermon,
Le p. 251 85. El p. 500D. D I, No. 783 86. Al p. 319. PR 1055-1056
87. Vin fo. 92b1 88. Jge a I, 214A 89. Co I, 136. M 1649 90. Sermon,
Ha IV, 163. M 45 91. Jge c p. 49. M 661 92. Jac a p. 5; Sermon,
Le p. 251 93. Bo b p. 280a 94. Sermon, Le p. 251 95. Mat p. 189.
LR I, 209 96. Jv p. 936B 97. Fu p. 561. LR I, 211 98. Gi I, 301.
LR II, 175 99. Jge a III, 565C (originally written in French)
100. Co II, 138. D II, Nos. 470-471. Cf. No. 120 101. Rom p. 603.

101. /Ab antiquo habemus quod quilibet/ Lopus in eadem pelle moritur in qua nascitur. Lopus capiatur et saepe per aurem trahatur, ut tandem presbiter fiat; semper tamen griseus erit.

102. /Dicitur quod/ Lopus uno mense vivit vento.

103. /Quotidianum est proverbium:/ Magni sponsoris rara ut plurimum fides est.

104. /De hoc dicitur in proverbio:/ Magnum dolorem colligit qui aurem suum rete facit.

105. /Vulgariter dicitur:/ Mala custodia pascit lupum.

106. Mala pungunt /ut vulgo dicitur/ illum qui consolatur.

107. /Vulgo dicitur malo filio:/ Maledictus pater qui te genuit, et mater quae te lactavit.

108. /Proverbialiter dici solet:/ Male orat qui sui obliviscitur.

109. Male expenditur quidquid malo impenditur.

110. /Vulgo dicitur:/ Male exspectat qui pendet.

111. /Proverbium vulgare est:/ Male ulciscitur dedecus sibi qui amputat nasum suum.

112. /Tanquam proverbialiter dici soleat:/ Mali vicini sunt illi, sicut et albi monachi.

113. /Sicut vulgares dicunt,/ Malus choraula bonus symphoniacus est.

114. /Vulgares de nobis iocabuntur dicentes:/ Malus monachus bonus clericus est.

115. /Episcopus volebat sibi/ Manus inungi.

116. /Vulgo dicitur quod/ Melior est ros unus vel pluvia maii quam thesaurus regis David.

117. /Dicitur vulgariter quod/ Melius valet amicus in via quam denarius in corrigia.

118. Melius valet de vobis serpellaria quam trossellum.

119. /Ut dicitur vulgariter,/ Mensura durat.

120. /Ut vulgo dicitur,/ Minervam docere vel ligna ad silvam vel aquam ad flumina sive mare deferre.

LR I, 180 102. Vin fo. 164a1 103. Jge a III, 1311B. M 461 104. Jge a III, 163D 105. Et p. 353. M 1207 106. Wi p. 193A. LR, 343? 107. Bo b p. 279a 108. Wty p. 594A. M 1178 109. Rom p. 641 110. Gu Sermon, PL 185 i, 13D. M 1158 111. Pb p. 426. M 2149 112. Gi IV, 207 113. Gi I, 224 114. Gi I, 224 115. Et p. 378; Wr p. 43; Jac a p. 15. Cf. Note of Crane on p. 149 116. Sermon, Ha III, 86 117. Sermon, Ha II, 89. M 1241 118. Et p. 228. "Mieux vaut le sac que le troussseau" 119. Et p. 411. M 1229 120. Be Epist. (ca.

121. /Solet communiter proverbium recitare,/ Miseris misericordia est necessaria, et de peccatore misericordia.

122. /Sicut alio notatur proverbio:/ Misero non obvenit bona scutella quam non effundat.

123. /Vulgari gallicano dicitur cum auditur aliquis alii adulari,/ Modo soporat illum.

124. /Vulgo dicitur quod/ Mortuus amicum non habet.

125. /Secundum quod solet dici,/ Mulier habet unam artem /i. e. unum decipiendi modum/ plus quam diabolus.

126. /Dici solet in antiquo rusticorum proverbio, quia/ Mulier non debet lugere mortem mariti vel filiorum suorum, sed potius tonitruum hiemale.

127. /Dicit etiam sententia:/ Muliebris garrulitas hoc solum tacere possit quod nescit.

128. /Communiter credunt et dicunt omnes:/ Munera sumpta ligant.

129. Nec summitate digiti /ut vulgo dicitur/ labores arduos attingere volunt.

130. /Proverbium hispanicum:/ Nec tollas consuetudinem nec inducas.

131. Nec ultra pallium competit pedem extendere.

132. /Ubi, sicut vulgo dicitur,/ Neque est caput neque cauda.

133. /Vulgare proverbium:/ Nescit sanus quid sentiat aeger, aut plenus quid patiatur ieiunus.

134. /Vulgari clamatur proverbio:/ Nihil aut modicum fieri pro litteris clausis.

135. Nil opertum quod non reveletur, nec occultum quod non sciatur.

136. /Sicut vulgo dicitur quod/ Nimis fortiter et profunde dormit qui culcitrarum sibi furari permittit.

137. /Vulgo dicitur:/ Noli laudare, ne habeas quod vituperes.

1143), PL 182, 415C. M 1487. Cf. No. 100 121. Ma IV, 215. M 535
 122. Jge a III, 411B. M 963 123. Wi p. 231D 124. Wi p. 198E. M 846
 125. Wr p. 15. M 740 126. Ma III, 254 127. Ja pp. 125-126. LR I, 231
 128. Pd p. 27. M 1076 129. Be Sermon, PL 183, 623A 130. La p. 85
 131. Gi III, 391. M 2240 132. Jge a III, 455C. "Neither head nor tail" 133. Be *De Diversis Gradibus Humilitatis et Superbiae*, ed. Horst-Mabillon (1719) I, 568A. M 1355 and 1353 134. Guib p. 48
 135. Treatise on Lord's Prayer (12th cent.), Ha II, 229; Wri p. 67.
 D II, No. 424 136. Bo b p. 260a 137. Rom p. 585. LR II, 337

138. a, /Ideo vulgariter dicitur:/ Noli te tantum inflare ut crepes.
 b, /Inde vulgare illud credimus tractum:/ Non te sic infles ut crepes.

139. /Proverbialiter dici solet:/ Non ante tertium diem equitabis.

140. a, /Cui ego et clericus, ipse vulgariter, ego poetice:/
 Non bene conveniunt, nec in una sede morantur
 cidaris et lancea.
 b, Non bene conveniunt, nec in una sede morantur
 munera et suffragia.

141. /Optime quidem gallicum est proverbium:/ Non esse mortuus qui carceratus est.

142. /Vulgo dicitur/ non esse tutum diu cohabitari serpenti.

143. /Vulgariter dicitur quod/ Non est dolor sicut dolor dentis.

144. /Vulgatum proverbium:/ Non est malum si non intendatur.

145. /Inter vulgaria solet proverbia recitari:/ Non habeas mutum in quacumque nave pro nauta.

146. /Vulgare proverbium est quod/ Non nimis exspectatur cum aliquid quod bonum est exspectatur.

147. /Vulgariter dicitur quod/ Non omnes sunt sapientes, nec expedit ut omnes sint stulti.

148. /Tritum etenim vulgo proverbium est:/ Non sibi soli, verum etiam socio sapiendum.

149. Non sint /ut vulgo dici solet/ mille milia passuum inter dictum et factum.

150. /Haec proverbio teneamus antiquo:/ Non studeas a cauda equi ponere frenum.

151. /Dicitur vulgariter:/ Non videt stultus in stultitia sua.

152. /Proverbium est quod/ Nova faciunt mirari.

138. a, Js p. 421; b, Rom p. 628. St. Guazzo, *La Civil Conversatione* (Venetia, 1609), p. 60a: "Non t'enfiare che non creppi" 139. Da *De Vulgari Eloquentia* I, vii, 17 140. a, Gui p. 144; b, Petrus Cantor, Ha II, 13. M 614 (Ovid, *Mett.*, II, 846) 141. Co III, 330 142. Wt PL 185 i, 231B 143. Wp p. 138B. M 1202 144. Jge a III, 931B. M 1879 145. An p. 113 146. Sermon, Ha IV, 240 147. Sermon, Ha II, 96 148. Co III, 184. Cf. No. 32 149. Co IV, 66. Giusti p. 130 150. An p. 122. LR I, 161 151. Sermon, Ha II, 85. M 790 152. Sermon, Ha

153. Nulla enim pestis efficacior ad nocendum quam familiaris inimicus.

154. /Vulgo autem dici solet quod/ Nullum animal audacius est equo caeco.

155. Nullus bonum habet, nisi ipsum comparet /est commune proverbium/.

156. /Verisimiliter igitur dicere possunt, quod vulgari gallicano dicitur, sc. quia/ Nunquam habuerunt pedes suos in religione, nec unquam in ea portaverunt pedes suos.

157. a, /Iuxta vulgare proverbium/ Oculos campi metuere et silvarum aures soleat semper habere suspectas.
b, /Iuxta vulgare proverbium/ Nemus aures et campus seu planities oculos habere dicuntur.

158. /Quasi/ Olivero currente.

159. /Ut vulgo dicitur:/ Omne quod est nimium, vertitur in vitium.

160. Omnem fert populus, quam facit princeps stultitiam /dicit proverbium/.

161. /Ut nunquam illo iuste valeant proverbio denotari, quod fertur:/ Omnem in ore proprio sordescere laudem.

162. /Vulgo dicitur de homine valde irato vel ascenso quod/ Omnia faceret.

163. Omnibus in factis gravis est incoptio prima.

164. a, /Proverbialiter dici solet:/ Omnis laus vera est ab hoste.
b, /Ut vulgariter proverbio dicitur,/ Vera laus est ab hoste.

165. Omnis presbiter commendat reliquias, et quaelibet vulpes suam laudat caudam.

166. /Sicut vulgariter dici solet,/ Operibus lupi congratulatur corvus.

167. /Tunctiones seu verbera tribulationum pagamenta sunt

III, 100. M 533 153. Wty p. 451C; Wri p. 46. M 1410 154. Jac a p. 17 155. Jge a III, 1542C 156. Wi p. 226E 157. a, Be *Epist.*, PL 182, 823A; b, Bo a VIII, 610A. M 269 158. Gi II, 293 and III, 88. "Avoir son olivier courant" O. F. = "avoir la chance, la vogue" 159. Ad p. 776A. M 1424 (May p. 254: "Dicit enim Isidorus: Omne quod est nimium convertitur in fastidium") 160. Jge a IV, 636D 161. An p. 11. M 2128 162. Bo b p. 255a 163. Jge a III, 798C. LR II, 318 164. a, Wty p. 525D; b, Sermon, Ha I, 50 165. Rom p. 585. LR I, 41 166. Guib p. 50. M 1769 167. Wi p. 247A 168. [pseudo-]

debitorum meorum, unde qui meos tundunt et verberant
quibuscumque molestiis/ pagamentum eorum ipsis pagant
/ut vulgo dicitur/.

168. /Illa sententia usitata:/ Panis et aqua vita beata.
169. /Proverbialiter dicitur illa maledictio:/ Parem habeas in domo.
170. /Vulgariter dicitur quod/ Parum valet pulchritudo sine bonitate.
171. /Dicitur vulgariter:/ Pauper est amor qui nunquam monstratur.
172. /Vulgo dicitur quod/ Pauper est qui non videt.
173. Pectina asinum, ablue asinum, rade asinum, nunquam perduces asinum ad bonum equum.
174. /Vulgariter enim dicitur quod/ Pectinem odit tineosus, et equus gibbosus, quando tangitur in struma vel ulcere, incipit calcitrare.
175. /Galdricus . . . / pedibus /ut aiunt/ ivit in sententiam /nepotis/.
176. Peior rota carri semper clamat.
177. Perdidit totum /ut vulgariter dicitur/, ova et gallinam.
178. Per malum asinarium perditur asinus, per malum nuncium amittitur negotium.
179. /Gallice dicitur:/ Per unum punctum perdidit Gilbertus asinum suum.
180. /Ut vulgari proverbio dicitur,/ Piscatores aqua turbida retia mittunt.
181. /Ut vulgo dicitur,/ Pleno negotio pertractari.
182. /Ut plenum dolium, ut vulgo dicitur, est/ Plenum usque ad oculum.
183. a, /Ut, quod in proverbium receptum est, affirmare possumus/ Plures per cenas quam per gladios occidisse.
b, Plures per gulam moriuntur quam in bello perimuntur.
184. Pone hoc ad caput tuum.
185. /Possent bene/ Ponere viellas subtus bancum.

Bo a VIII, 217b 169. Da *De Mon.* I, v, 36 170. Sermon, Ha IV, 101. M 1922 171. Sermon, Ha IV, 64 172. Sermon, Ha III, 135. LR II, 307 173. Od p. 196. Cf. No. 1 174. Jac c p. 199. M 980 175. Wt p. 232B 176. Sermon, Ha IV, 149. M 23 177. May p. 249 178. Ta p. XII 179. Ro p. 40. M 1702* 180. Letter to Be PL 182, 683C. D II, No. 483. Cf. No. 7 181. Pa a p. 701D 182. Bo b p. 253b 183. a, Co I, 270; b, May p. 253. D II, No. 87 184. Ta p. XII 185. Ro p. 26. LR I, LI

186. /Vulgariter dicitur quod/ Primo oportet cervum capere et postea, cum captus fuerit, illum excoriare.

187. /Solet vulgariter dici:/ Privatus dominus temerarios nutrit.

188. Pulchra facies valet unum ferculum.

189. Qualis erat mulier, tale coquebat olus.

190. Qualis ergo paterfamilias, tales et domestici eius.

191. /Vulgari proverbio dicitur, quia/ Quanto magis exaltatur inquis, tanto amplius adversus benefactorem suum se extollit.

192. Quae nimis apparent retia vitat avis.

193. /Vulgo dicitur:/ Qui bene est non se moveat.

194. /Dicitur vulgariter:/ Qui bene faciet, bene inveniet.

195. /Dicitur vulgo quia/ Qui bene se pascit bene vivit.

196. Qui dat maior est quam qui recipit.

197. a, /Dicitur vulgariter quod/ Qui de longe sibi providet de prope gaudet.
b, Qui a longe videt de prope gaudet.

198. /Vulgo dicitur:/ Qui de suo prandio aliquid reservat, inde melius est, quando coenat.

199. /Communi autem dicitur adagio:/ Qui Dominum diligit, eius diligit gubernationem, et qui regem diligit, eius legem diligit.

200. a, Qui est garnitus non est aunitus.
b, Dicitur vulgariter:/ Qui est praemunitus non est confusus.

201. /Dicitur vulgariter:/ Qui facit quod potest legem suam implet.

202. /In proverbiis rusticani:/ Qui habet malum vicinum, habet malum matutinum.

186. He III, 234 187. Be *Tract. de Grad. Hum.*, ed. cit., I, 578E. M 1723
 188. Sermon, Ha II, 283. M 220 189. Cae III, 15. K. F. W. Wander,
Deutsches Sprichwörterlexikon (Leipzig, 1867–1880), V, 64 190. Be
 Sermon, PL 183, 484A. LR II, 87 191. De p. 162 192. Jac a p. 32.
 LR I, 189 193. El p. 544A. M 1841 194. Sermons, Ha III, 280 and
 IV, 45. M 1843 195. Be Sermon, PL 183, 407B 196. Sermon, Ha
 II, 234 197. a, Sermon, Ha II, 98. M 1898; b, Sermon, Ha V, 35.
 M 1899 198. El p. 678B; Le p. 251. LR II, 195 199. Jge a IV, 653B
 200. a, Sermon, Le p. 251. M 1923; b, Sermon, Ha III, 290. M 1924
 201. Sermon, Ha V, 41; M 1936 202. Fu p. 806; Ta p. XII. M 1809

- 203. /Proverbium illud . . . / Qui hoc facit quod nullus, mirantur omnes.
- 204. /Tritum siquidem proverbium est:/ Qui lepores agitat, verba consumit.
- 205. /Iuxta illud vulgare quod/ Qui magis amat, magis laudat.
- 206. /Dicitur certe vulgari quodam proverbio:/ Qui me amat, amat et canem meum.
- 207. /Proverbialiter dicitur:/ Qui non cavet expensam, ante mendicat, quam sentiat.
- 208. /Vulgo dicitur:/ Qui non est prudens, sit saltem bene credens.
- 209. /Vulgariter dicitur:/ Qui parum me diligit, parum bonum de me dicit.
- 210. Qui servit rustico, perdit eum.
- 211. a, /Iuxta dictum vulgare,/ Qui sic neglexerit famam suam crudelis est.
b, /Unde etiam dici solet:/ Qui famam suam negligit crudelis est.
- 212. /Rusticanum et forte Offelli proverbium est:/ Qui somniis et auguriis credit, nunquam fore securum.
- 213. a, /Ut dicitur,/ Qui totum capit, totum perdit.
b, Qui totum cupit, totum perdit.
- 214. /Iuxta illud quod vulgo dicitur:/ Qui vadit ad votum suum, vadit ad dolorem suum.
- 215. Quidam vigilant canem qui dormit.
- 216. a, /Vulgo dicitur:/ Quilibet plangit telam suum.
b, Quaelibet vetula conqueritur damnum suum.
c, Quaelibet vetula plangit damnum suum.
- 217. /Dicitur enim vulgariter quod/ Quis potest esse servus unius et liber homo alterius.
- 218. /Vulgati versus gravis sententia:/ Quisque potest rebus succurrere, nemo diebus.
- 219. Quisquis contra stimulum recalcitraverit, duplo pungetur.

203. Be *De Consid.*, PL 182, 439B; Ga p. 394A; *Vita Secunda Auctore Alano*, PL 185 i, 486D. Cf. No. 147 204. Jsa a I, 35 205. Js p. 439
 206. Be Sermon, PL 183, 449A. M 1974* 207. Ja pp. 703-704 208. Bo b [Append.] p. 351a 209. Js p. 432 210. Bo a VIII, 664A. M 725
 211. Pa b p. 19 212. Jsa a I, 65. Cf. Horace, *Sat.* II, 2, 2-3 (Webb)
 213. a, Od p. 212; b, Js p. 428. LR II, 407 214. Bo b p. 261b. M 2188
 215. Ta p. XII 216. a, Bo b p. 266a; b, Sermon, Ha V, 36; c, Sermon, Ha III, 284. M 345 217. He III, 284 218. Jge a III, 1022D 219. Be

220. /Vulgo dicitur:/ Quo dolor est dentis, versatur lingua dolentis.
 221. /Ut vulgo dicitur:/ Quod differtur, non aufertur.
 222. /Ut verum canit proverbium:/ Quod dominus concedit, non iure familia denegabit.
 223. Quod in corde, hoc in ore.
 224. /Vulgo dicitur:/ Quod non videt oculus, cor non dolet.
 225. /Proverbialiter dici solet:/ Quot homines, tot sententiae.
 226. Reddere aut pendere /ut dicitur vulgariter/.
 227. Refrixerint /ut dici solet/ ferramenta: quid si ferveant?
 228. /Ut vulgus loquitur,/ Sacci carbonum, alter alterum pessimis modis maculantes.
 229. /Ut vulgo dicitur,/ Saliens antequam videat, casurus antequam debeat.
 230. Servus regis par est comiti.
 231. Si caput aegrotat, cetera membra dolent.
 232. /Secundum vulgare proverbium:/ Si fuerit qui faciat, erit qui dicat.
 233. /Dicitur vulgari proverbio:/ Si quis amat Botrachan Luna videtur ei.
 234. Si quis debet et non reddit, iustum est si malum prendit.
 235. a, /Vulgo enim dicitur: quia/ Sola miseria caret invidia.
 b, Miseria enim /ut aiunt/ invidia caret.
 236. /Ut dici vulgo solet,/ Solus brachio extenso, rationibus non evacuatis remansi.
 237. /Ut proverbialiter dici solet,/ Stimulus anum accelerat.
 238. /Verum est de illis proverbium:/ Stultus non credit, donec accipit.

Sermon, PL 183, 594A. M 1873. Cf. No. 59 220. Bo b p. 265a. M 1039
 221. Bo b p. 298a. D I, No. 123 222. Jge a III, 515D. M 1774?
 223. Rom p. 642. LR II, 275 224. Be Sermon, PL 183, 478A. M 1766
 225. Wty pp. 880D, 615D. LR II, 244 226. Et p. 363. M 1571*
 227. Co IV, 316 228. Jge a I, 111A. LR II, 180 229. [pseudo-] Be PL 184, 456D. M 1798* 230. Sermon, Ha IV, 163. M 2255 231. Fu p. 152. M 443. Cf. No. 39 232. Guib p. 46. B. J. Whiting, *Speculum*, X (1935), p. 297, No. 34 233. Wi p. 200H. M 1874. I owe the identification of *Botrachan* = "ranam" to Prof. Leo Spitzer of The Johns Hopkins University. For another version of this proverb, cf. No. 279.
 234. May p. 263 235. a, Pb p. 108; b, Be Sermon, PL 183, 359B. LR II, 369 236. Co IV, 174 237. Su p. 69. M 29 238. Jge a III, 1122B.

239. /In vulgari proverbio dicitur:/ Stultus non verbis, non exemplis, sed plagis vix corrigitur, donec diros ictus recipit.

240. Suaviter /iuxta vulgare proverbium/ natat, cuius alter sustinet mentum.

241. /Ut in proverbio habetur,/ Sub rosarum mollicie spinae pungunt.

242. /Ut vulgo dicitur,/ Talis aqua inflat et non satiat.

243. a, /Vulgariter dicitur:/ Tantum valet qui tenet pedem, quantum qui excoriatur.
b, /Ut vulgari verbo utar:/ Unus tondet, alter expilat, unus pedem tenet, alter excoriatur.

244. Timebat /ut vulgo dicitur/ pelli sua.

245. Trahunt aquam ad suum molendinum.

246. /Vulgo dicitur:/ Tristem se facit aut magnificat se.

247. a, /Sicut proverbialiter dici solet:/ Ubi amor, ibi oculus; ubi dolor, ibi manus.
b, Ubi amor, ibi oculus; ubi dolor, ibi digitus.
c, /In proverbio dicitur:/ Ubi amor, ibi est oculus.
d, /Solemus parabolice dicere:/ Ubi dolor, ibi manus.

248. Ubi (canes) mordere non possunt, latrare non cessant.

249. a, Ubi enim necessitatis incumbit articulus, legis exuberat detrimentum.
b, Necessitas non habet legem.

250. a, Unica prava pecus inficit omne pecus.
b, Unica ovis infirma totum inficit gregem.
c, Ne una ovis morbida totum gregem contaminet.

251. /Mulieribus debetis relinquere rusticannis, quae consueverunt suo semper habere in ore:/ Uno quidem ictu non inciditur penitus arbor.

252. a, Usus facit magistrum.
b, Usus reddit magistrum.

M 729* 239. Wj p. 859D 240. Be Sermon, PL 183, 234D. M 2263
 241. Co I, 120. LR I, 84 242. Bo b p. 294b 243. a, May p. 159; b, Pb p. 231 244. Pv p. 607C; Sa b p. 223 245. Vi fo. 159A. Cf. M 352
 246. Be Sermon, PL 183, 170B 247. a, Wty p. 571D; b, Th p. 357;
 c, Sermon, Ha, I, 53; d, Fu p. 801. M 1020, 1022 248. Gi III, 16
 249. a, Mat p. 118; b, Jge c p. 49. M 237* 250. a, Jge a III, 1512,
 IV, 719D, III, 284B; b, Jge a III, 946C; c, Be Epist. (1139), PL 182,
 530D. LR I, 151 251. An p. 117. M 189* 252. a, Jsa b p. 21 (Webb)

253. /Iuxta vulgare proverbium,/ Vacuae manus cassa est petitio.
 254. /Unum verbum communiter dicitur:/ Velit, nolit, vadit sacerdos ad synodum.
 255. Vendentes ratum in sacco.
 256. /Dicitur quod/ Veritas non quaerit angulos.
 257. /Vulgariter dicitur:/ Villanus est ille qui facit villaniam, non qui in villa nascitur.

2. PROVERBS IN LATIN AND VERNACULAR.

258. /Vulgariter dicitur:/ Ad bonum finem vadit totum. *En la bone fin vait tot.*
 259. *Les vielles voies doit l'en tenir.* Antiquae viae sunt meliores.
 260. a, /Gallicum proverbium respondebat:/ Berta omnia bona mea in potestate habuit, totum habeat quod pro anima sua fecit. *Berte fu ale mait: se le sen dona, si en ait.*
 b, *Berte fu ale mait: s'ele donat, si en ait.* Sic dedit sic habeat.
 c, *Berte fu a la mait: se qu'elle prit elle a, et plus n'en portera.*
 261. /Dicitur in communi proverbio vulgariter:/ *Les bons livres font les bons clercs;* boni libri bonos faciunt clericos.
 262. /Dicitur vulgariter:/ *Cui diex veut aidier nus ne li puet nuire.* Bonum habet adiutorium qui Deum habet adiutorem.
 263. /Proverbium Anglicum de servis est:/ *Hause hund to godsib and stent in thir oder hond,* quod est: Canem suscipe compatrem et altera manu baculum.

[note]: "Hoc prouerbium alibi adhuc non repperi"); b, Mat p. 185. M 2458 253. El p. 529A. M 576 254. Sermon, Ha IV, 103. LR I, 40 255. Ro Treatise on Matrimony, Ha I, 199 256. Jg p. 922; Ja pp. 501-502. M 2468 257. May p. 263. Giusti p. 175 258. Sermon, Ha IV, 117. M 44 259. Sermon, Ha II, 284. M 1052 260. a, Jac a p. 77; b, Sermon, Le p. 255; c, Sermon, J. Morawski, "Les Recueils d'anciens proverbes français," *Romania*, XLVIII (1922), p. 516 (only in French); neither G. Paris, who found the proverb obscure and quoted several texts where it occurs (*Romania*, XX [1891], p. 138), nor Morawski knew the passage of Jacques de Vitry, which is somewhat more detailed than the variant cited by Morawski; *la mait* O. F. = "la huche, le pétrin." M 235 261. Jge b p. 9. LR II, 122 262. Sermon, Ha IV, 21. M 440 263. Wa

264. Contrafaciunt *la madeleine ou la madeleine croisée*.
 265. /Vulgariter dicitur que/ *Maladie est par son contraire guérie*.
 266. Curtum et grossum facite mihi sudarium, ne luto inquietur. Quod est dicere secundum vulgare Gallicorum: *Curt le me fetes pour ne le croter*.
 267. Of (eie) hi the brothe of athele hi ne mythte. Hoc est: De ove te eduxi, de natura non potui.
 268. /Dicit proverbium commune:/ *A tort et a travers faire mal iogar lo balestrir*. Hinc et inde facit male ludere balistarium.
 269. /Unde et in Teutonico regno quotiens quis delinquere videtur, de natione quacunque, quasi proverbialiter in suo vulgari dici solet:/ *Untriwe Sax*, hoc est, infidelis Saxo.
 270. Malum est se capere fortiore; *il se fait mau prendre a plus for que soi*.
 271. *Ne la vache ne le veel*, id est, nec vaccam nec vitulum tibi dabo.
 272. *Besoing fait la vielle troter*, id est, necessitas facit vetulas currere.
 273. Nescit rusticus quid valent calcaria; *ne set vilen que sporon valent*.
 274. /Dicitur quod/ Non est festum bibere ad cyphum clamatoris vini. *Ce nest pas feste de boere vin a hanap de crier*.
 275. /Vulgariter dicitur et est sumptum de Eccl. 3:/ *Omnia tempus habent*; gallice: *toutes choses on lor sayson*.
 276. Qui mane non surgit dietam dimittit. *En main lever est la journée*.
 277. a, /Solet dici:/ *Selde cumet se betere*; hoc est: Raro succedit melior.
 b, /Solet dici:/ *Selde comet the lattere the betere*.
 278. /Gallice dicitur:/ Satis emit qui petit; *assez achate qui demande*.

p. 211. M 1888 264. Ro p. 15. *Faire la Madeleine* O. F. = "affecter le repentir, l'humilité" 265. Sermon, Ha III, 343 266. Jac a p. 50 267. Od p. 181 268. Vin fo. CLIXa 269. Gi III, 27 270. Sermon, Ha IV, 166 271. Jac a p. 47 272. Jge b p. 6. M 236 273. Sermon, Ha IV, 104. M 1359 274. Sermon, Ha IV, 147; Ta p. XII (only in French) 275. Sermon, Ha III, 270. LR II, 428 276. Sermon, Ha VI, 69. M 181 277. a, Od p. 179; b, Wr p. 50 278. Sermon, Ha IV,

279. *Ky crepaude eyme, lune ly semle.* Si quis amat ranam,
ranam putat esse Dianam.

280. *Tiel manace que ad paour,* quod est dictum: Talis minatur
qui timorem habet.

281. *A tart bea Gobaut,* id est, tarde hiavit Gobaudus.

282. *Tantes viles tantes guises;* tot civitates quot consuetudines.

3. PROVERBS IN VERNACULAR.

A. In French.

283. /Vulgare carmen illud:/ *A mes premieres amour je me tiendray.*

284. *Beau promettre et riens doner fait le foil conforter.*

285. *Bien set chat ki barbe il leche.*

286. /Et in Gallico sonantius dicitur:/ *C'est grande portion et bonne a partir.*

287. /Unde proverbium iuxta illud insurrexit:/ *Comme qui n'ara une couronne, il n'ara point de couronne.*

288. /Vulgari proverbio dicitur:/ *Curtasia si vaut mult e si cotepo.* /Variant: *Cortexia de bocha asa vale epocho costa./*

289. /Solet dici de mala muliere:/ *Ele a les talons porris.*

290. /Proverbium vulgare:/ *Les hommes font la guerre et Dieu la victoire.*

291. *O sein Martin, eide nostre oiselin.*

292. *Quant on crie aus loups, aus loups, ils s'enfuent, et ainsi ils lessent leur proie.*

293. *Qui est tigneus, il ne doit pas oster son chaperon.*

294. /De quibus dici solet vulgariter:/ *Qui ne le croit, il n'est pas damné.*

295. *Tant give li purcel, cume uolt li chael.*

296. /Vulgariter dicitur:/ *Tot fu autrui, tot iert autrui.*

146. M 133 279. Wr p. 53. M 1874. Cf. No. 233 280. Rog p. 70.
 M 2363 281. Jac a p. 57 282. Sermon, Ha II, 279. LR II, 183
 283. Jge a III, 708B 284. Rog p. 52. M 230 285. Gi I, 218. M 264
 286. Jge a III, 1127C 287. Jv p. 938B 288. Ja pp. 645-646. M 426
 289. Gut p. 47 290. Jge a I, 210A 291. Od p. 184 292. Jv p. 937A
 293. Jv p. 936D 294. Jge a IV, 864C 295. Gi I, 218. M 2298 296. Wp

297. /Proverbialiter dicitur: *Que/ Toujours songe trannyne (recte : truye) bran.*

B. In English.

298. /Unde solet dici:/ *Thai thu wolf hore hodi te preste tho thu hyme sette Salmes to lere, ever beth his geres to the groue-ward.*

p. 26Z. M 2404 297. Jv p. 935C. A. Oudin, "Curiosités françoises" (1656), La Curne de Sainte Palaye, *Dictionnaire historique de l'ancien langage françois* (Niort-Paris, 1882), X, 354: *Une truye songe tousjours bren* 298. Od p. 195

APPENDIX.

Vernacular Proverbs in the *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum*.³⁰

1. /Sicut scribitur:/ Amicus necessitate probatur. II, 45; p. 256.
2. /Secundum commune proverbium,/ Ars Margarethae est mirabile rete. I, 34; p. 51.
3. Deus benedicat vobis balneum. I, 46; p. 71.
4. /Si perdo tertiam, tunc/ Diabolus erit Abbas. II, 32; p. 238.
5. Diabolus tenebit candelam. II, 24; p. 225. II, 30; p. 237. II, 38; p. 248.
6. Distillare per viltrum et saccum. I, 43-44; p. 67.
7. /Versus:/ Laus proprio sordet in ore. Teutonice: *Eygenlob stinckt geren.* II, 16; p. 215.
8. /Sed scitis bene quod/ Multi canes superlatrant unum. II, 7; p. 195.
9. Mus miser est antro qui solum clauditur uno. I, 3; p. 7.
10. a, /Putatis quod sum/ Natus super arborem sicut poma. I, 3; p. 7.
b, /Credunt quod sum/ Natus super arborem. II, 19; p. 219.
11. Non semper oleum /sicut communiter dicunt/. II, 40; p. 250.
12. /Dicterium poeticum,/ Nullum damnum solum. I, 45; p. 68.

³⁰ *Ulrichi Hutteni Equitis Operum Supplementum. Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum*, ed. E. Böcking (Leipzig, 1864), I.

13. Omne promissum cadit in debitum. II, 15; p. 214.
14. /Communiter dicitur,/ Quandocunque abbas, id est pater supremus, apponit tesseras, tunc possunt fratres ludere. II, 67; p. 295.
15. /Ut communiter dicitur,/ Qui est inter lupos, oportet ululare cum lupis. II, 3; p. 190.
16. Qui procul est oculis, procul est a cordis lumine. II, 22; p. 222.
17. Schlim schlem quaerit sibi similem. II, 3; p. 190.
18. Si unus acciperet mihi vestimenta, tunc perdidisse pau-pertatem meam totaliter. Sicut dixit semel una vetula quando fregit ova super pontem in Helpruna. II, 66; p. 293.
19. Ubi enim diabolus pervenire vel aliquid efficere non potest, ibi semper mittit unam malam antiquam vetulam vel unum monachum. II, 65; p. 291.
20. /Utinam omnes poetae essent ibi,/ Ubi piper crescit. I, 25; p. 38. II, 58; p. 276.
21. Unusquisque debet manere in facultate sua, et non debet mittere falcem in messem alterius. I, 15; p. 24. II, 33; p. 241.
22. Valete laetius quam apis in thymo vel piscis in undis. I, 43-44; p. 68.

† ARPAD STEINER.

BOETHIUS AND THE HISTORY OF THE *ORGANON*.

Boethius had set himself the task of bringing into Latin the entire body of Plato's and Aristotle's writings.¹ What he actually accomplished, the translation of Aristotle's logical treatises, was a small part of this huge enterprise. There is, besides, his translation of Porphyry's *Eisagoge*.

The chronological order of these translations (and of the commentaries which accompany them) has been determined with reasonable certainty by two scholars, Samuel Brandt and Arthur P. McKinlay who, though differing in their method and criteria, have yet arrived at fundamentally identical results.² The sequence appears to have been as follows: Porphyry's *Eisagoge*, Aristotle's *Categories*, *Peri Hermeneias*, *Analytica Priora*, *Posteriora*, *Topica*, *Sophistici Elenchi*. It could not remain unnoticed that this sequence is identical with the order in which the original works are integrated in the standard collection of Aristotle's logical works commonly known as the *Organon*; in fact, Brandt³ points out that Boethius simply followed the order which he found established in his Greek original. This suggestion is, as we shall see, perfectly correct; but a student of Aristotle will be aware that the existence of the *Organon* (or of any fixed order of these writings) by A. D. 500 has never been proved.⁴ Shall we then say that the studies of Brandt and McKinlay have supplied the *terminus ante quem* for its existence

¹ In *librum περὶ ἐπονητας* Comment., Secunda editio, II, 3, p. 79, 16 Meiser.

² S. Brandt, *Philol.*, LXII (1903), pp. 141-54, 234-79; A. P. McKinlay, *H. S. C. P.*, XVIII (1907), pp. 123-56. See also E. K. Rand, *Jahrbücher f. class. Philol.*, Suppl. XXVI (1901), pp. 428 ff.

³ *Loc. cit.*, p. 260. Aristotle (*A. Pr.* A4, 25 b 26) had made it clear that the *Analytica Posteriora* was to be considered a sequel to the *Priora*. Apart from this, he has nothing to do with the order sanctioned in the *Organon*. On the term *ὅρασις* and its application to Aristotle's *logica*, see e. g. Karl Prantl, *Geschichte der Logik im Abendland* (Leipzig, 1855), I, p. 532 (especially notes 4 and 5); see also W. Christ and W. Schmid, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte* (6th ed., Muenchen, 1920), I, p. 729, n. 3.

⁴ W. D. Ross, *Aristotle* (3rd ed., London, 1937), p. 20, n. 6, suggests that the term "Organon" was in the sixth century applied to the collection of Aristotle's logical works.

which the students of Aristotle's own works have failed to find? In a sense this is true, but if we wish to have the complete picture a few more facts must be taken into account.

Byzantine manuscripts of Aristotle's logic, which are very numerous, invariably have the writings in the "orthodox" order, given above. Just as invariably they include Porphyry's *Eisagoge* as the first item, i. e. preceding the *Categories*.⁵ To most scholars these facts would indicate that there were one or more late ancient editions in which the works were thus arranged. I do not know whether anyone would be inclined to think of a Byzantine scholar as responsible for the arrangement, but if anyone did he would certainly find it very difficult to maintain this view against the witness of Boethius; for it is precisely here that Boethius' testimony becomes important.

Having seen that the sequence in which he translated the works is reasonably certain, we now may say that it agrees with the order found in the Byzantine MSS. We should add that for Boethius, too, the *Eisagoge* is an integral part of the *corpus logicum*. For it is noteworthy that, although he knows very well that Porphyry wrote it as an Introduction to the *Categories* only, nevertheless he looks at it as Introduction to the entire *corpus* of Aristotle's logical writings.⁶ At the beginning of the *Dialogi in Porphyrium* Boethius discusses under conventional headings a number of preliminary questions. One of these headings is *ordo* ($\tau\alpha\xi\sigma$), and under this Boethius gives us what is evidently a justification of the orthodox sequence, that is, he makes clear that for logical reasons the *Analytica Priora* must precede both the *Posteriora* and the *Topics*, that *Peri Hermeneias* must come before the *Priora*, and that the *Categories* is logically prior to *Peri Hermeneias*.⁷ He continues:

sed Aristoteles hactenus. speculatus autem Porphyrius si categoriae sunt genera rerum, rerum vero sermonumque diversitas speciebus differentiis propriisque insigniretur, videns etiam quod

⁵ On the MSS (some of which belong to the tenth century) see Theodor Waitz, *Aristotelis Organon Graece* (Leipzig, 1844), I, pp. 1-29; *Aristotelis Topica*, ed. by J. Strache and M. Wallies (Leipzig, 1923), pp. v ff.

⁶ Cf. on the one hand *Dialogi*, I, 5 (p. 15, 1 ff. Brandt) where *inscriptio* is discussed, on the other hand the passage under the heading *ordo* which will be quoted in the text and cited in note 7 *infra*.

⁷ I, 5 (p. 14, 7 ff. Brandt).

accidentium in categoriis magna vis est . . . praelibat igitur nobis Porphyrius ad horum verissimam cognitionem hoc de generibus, speciebus, differentiis, propriis, accidentibus tractatu⁸ . . . recte igitur et filo lineae quodam hic Porphyrii liber primus legentibus studiorum praegustator et quodammodo initiator occurrit.

Let us note especially the words *legentibus . . . occurrit*. Boethius could not have told us more plainly that the Greek manuscripts which he knew had the works in the same order in which we find them in the Byzantine. Even though he is commenting on Victorinus' Latin translation of the *Eisagoge*, he thinks of the Greek original and of its place at the head of the standard edition. We also learn from him that the "orthodox" sequence is that in which the works were read, studied, and explained *in studiis*.⁹ These *studia* are in all probability the courses on logic which formed an essential part of the Neoplatonic curriculum.

A number of passages in Boethius' Greek contemporary and fellow Neoplatonist Ammonius (son of Hermias)¹⁰ tell the same story. As both Boethius and Ammonius evidently refer to established conditions which must have prevailed for some time, we are justified in saying that by the end of the fifth century the *Organon* (headed by the *Eisagoge*) was in existence.

The *terminus post quem* for the *Organon* is the year (about 270¹¹) in which Porphyry wrote the *Eisagoge*. He did not write

⁸ This is a description of the *Eisagoge*.

⁹ See also I, 5 (p. 12, 20 Brandt): *omnes post Porphyrium ingredientes ad logicam huius primum libelli traditores (tractatores edd. before Brandt) fuerunt*, etc. Brandt may be right in keeping *traditores* in the text even though in the only passage (*De fide cath.*, 218) cited for the word in Lane Cooper's *A Concordance of Boethius* (Cambridge, Mass., 1928) it means "traitor." Yet other writers of the time use it in the sense of "instructor." Cf. also II, 32 and Brandt's comments in the *Praefatio* to his edition (Vienna, 1906), p. xi. The authors of our standard textbooks on Latin Literature or Medieval Philosophy fail to make clear that Boethius found the *Eisagoge* in the same *codex* (or *codices*) as Aristotle's logical works.

¹⁰ See especially Ammonius, in *A. Pr. (Comm. in Arist. Graeca*, IV, 6), pp. 1, 3-2, 29; 4, 36-9; also in *Int. (ibid.*, IV, 5), pp. 1, 24-2, 9; 4, 17-24. The commentators defend the standard sequence of Aristotle's logical works by pointing out that the "term" is prior to the "sentence," the "sentence" prior to the "syllogism."

¹¹ Cf. J. Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre* (Ghent and Leipzig, 1913), pp. 51 ff.

it as an introduction to a new edition of Aristotle's *logica*; and, although we find him in another work polemizing against men who would place the *Categories* before the *Topics*, the wording of his polemic¹² shows that he did not either know or contemplate a fixed order.

And yet it is probable that the standard collection owes its existence in large measure to the labors of Porphyry and Iamblichus. For that the Neoplatonists are responsible for it is suggested not only by the inclusion of the *Eisagoge* but also by a consideration of the conditions of intellectual life in the fourth century. This is the time when the Neoplatonists became the guardians not only of pagan intellectual civilization in general but also of the Aristotelian legacy in particular. Witness the imposing series of their commentaries, of those preserved as well as of those merely attested. Porphyry himself seems to have concentrated on the *Categories* but is also mentioned as commentator of *περὶ ἐρμηνείας*, and Iamblichus wrote commentaries on the *Categories*, *περὶ ἐρμηνείας*, and the *Analytica Priora*.¹³ Now, the commentaries of these men are closely connected with their teaching; they were primarily designed to help their students to a better understanding of Aristotle's logic, and it is difficult to imagine that the Neoplatonic professors should have left it to their students (the "Freshmen" in Philosophy) to study the various logical works of Aristotle in whichever sequence

¹² In *Cat.* (*Comm. in Arist. Graeca*, IV, 1), p. 56, 23: διὰ τὸ γὰρ πρὸ τῶν τοπικῶν ἀλλ' οὐχὶ μᾶλλον πρὸ τῶν ἀναλυτικῶν καὶ πρὸ τοῦ περὶ ἐρμηνείας κτλ. On champions of the theory opposed by Porphyry cf. Prantl, *op. cit.*, p. 531. Boethius, *Ad Arist. Praed.*, 114, simply reproduces Porphyry's polemic (cf. J. Bidez, *Mus. Belg.*, II [1923], pp. 189 ff.); it would be a mistake to suppose that the controversy was still acute at his time. It is not impossible that even before Porphyry Aristotle's logical works had at times been arranged in what later became the standard sequence; But I fail to find definite evidence for this. The sequence certainly remained a matter for controversy (see again Prantl) until the Neoplatonists settled it.

¹³ The best presentation of the evidence is found in Eduard Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, III, 2 (4th ed., Leipzig, 1903), p. 696, n. 5; p. 741, n. 3 (see also on Syrianus *ibid.*, p. 820, n. 2 and *passim* on other Neoplatonists). Zeller appears to have been mistaken in crediting Porphyry with a commentary on the *Analytica Posteriora*; an Arabic text quoted by Bidez (*Vie de Porphyre*, p. 55*) suggests that the work in question was an Introduction to the Categorical Syllogisms.

they might choose. Even if the teaching of a man like Iamblichus did not cover the remaining parts of the *Organon*, the place of the *Analytica Posteriora* would yet be fixed as soon as was that of the *Priora*, and the *Topics* and *Sophistici Elenchi* would thus automatically find their place at the end of the collection. For these reasons I should be inclined to place the origin of the standard collection in the fourth century rather than in the fifth, but admit that this is not certain. If we are cautious, we shall say that the edition on which Boethius and the Byzantines—and, except for the inclusion of the *Eisagoge*, all modern editors and almost all writers on Aristotle—depend came into existence between the end of the third and the end of the fifth century. By this time the *codex* had come into general use,¹⁴ and it was possible to assemble several, perhaps even all, of the works in one *codex*. In fact, the general adoption of the *codex* may be regarded as a prior condition to the fixing of a sequence; so long as each of the works filled one or several rolls, a fixed sequence would mean little.

I have no competence to deal with the study and the transmission of the *Organon* in the Orient, but it may be well to mention that two facts which the students of Syriac, Arabic, and Hebrew literature have pointed out find their explanation on the Greek side. These students tell us (1) that for the Syrians Porphyry's *Eisagoge* was the first part of the *Organon*.¹⁵ Well, this is what we should expect. In Arabic and Hebrew translations, too, the *Eisagoge* is often included (e. g. in Averroes' *Middle Commentary* and *Epitome*);¹⁶ but, as Professor H. A. Wolfson has kindly informed me, the Arabic and Hebrew students of Aristotle were more aware of the individual entity of this work. The other point (2) is that Syrians and Arabs regard Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* as part of the *Organon* and are in the habit of referring to "the eight" or "nine books" of this collection ("eight" if the *Eisagoge* is not counted).¹⁷ Here

¹⁴ Recent discussions suggesting a still earlier use of the *codex* have no bearing on our question.

¹⁵ See e. g. Anton Baumstark, *Aristoteles bei den Syrern* (Leipzig, 1900), p. xii and *passim*.

¹⁶ See Moritz Steinschneider, *Die Hebraeischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters* (Berlin, 1893), pp. 43 ff.; *idem*, *Alfarabi* (St. Petersburg, 1869), p. 19 and p. 46, n. 61.

¹⁷ See e. g. *Alfarabi, Catalogo de las ciencias*, ed. A. G. Palencia

too their practice follows a Neoplatonic precedent; for, as Richard Walzer has pointed out,¹⁸ some Neoplatonic authorities of the sixth century considered either both works or, at least, the *Rhetic* an integral part of the *Organon*. The latter view is that of Simplicius and Philoponus; the former was held by Olympiodorus and Elias the Armenian. It seems unnecessary to go into details since the passages are written out and competently discussed in Walzer's article. Evidently, this is the school of thought which prevailed in the Orient, though it had no influence on either the Byzantine tradition or the Latin translator.¹⁹

FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

(Madrid, 1932), pp. 141-3. For more material see H. A. Wolfson in *Hebrew Union College Jubilee Volume* (Cincinnati, 1925), pp. 305 ff. I am indebted to Professor Wolfson for the references incorporated in notes 16 and 17.

¹⁸ *Stud. Ital.*, N. S. XI (1934), pp. 5-14, especially pp. 10 ff.

¹⁹ A question which at the present time we can hardly attempt to answer is whether Boethius, when he had finished his translations of Porphyry's and Aristotle's logical works, integrated them in a "Latin Organon." In the MSS the sequence of the translations (and commentaries) which go under his name is much less uniform than that of the Greek originals. We may be able to decide this question if and when we get a new *recensio* of the translations. At present we cannot even be quite sure that the versions of the *Analytica*, *Topica*, and *Sophistici Elenchi* which go under Boethius' name are really his. See, however, C. H. Haskins in *Harv. Stud. Class. Phil.*, XXV (1914), pp. 90-6; H. R. Patch, *The Tradition of Boethius* (New York, 1935), p. 32. Needless to say, a *recensio* of Boethius' translations would also be of great value for that of the Greek original. Strache and Wallies (see note 5 *supra*) use the text of a 16th century edition of Boethius' translations for this purpose (see their *praefatio*, p. xii). This procedure would in any case be open to serious objections; it is doubly so because the text of this edition seems to have been arbitrarily "adjusted" to that of the Greek works.

"THE LILY" IN THE DANCE.

Among the figures, or *schemata*, of the Greek dance, the names of which have come down to modern times in tantalizingly vague connotations, is the "lily"—*κρίνον*. Athenaeus (III, 114 f), after speaking of the word as the name of a kind of loaf of bread, remarks: *καλούμενον καὶ σχῆμα τι χορικῆς ὁρχήσεως παρ' Ἀπολλοφάνει ἐν Δαλίδι*. Hesychius (*s. v.*) notes the curious (probably slang) use of the word to mean a beggar, a corpse, or a refugee, and adds: *καὶ σχῆμα χορικῆς ὁρχήσεως*. Eustathius (1018) mentions the word as denoting a cake, and then quotes Athenaeus. Most modern writers on the dance merely make the comment that the nature of the dance or *schema* so designated is unknown.

Even the origin of the word *κρίνον* is uncertain. Its synonym, *λείριον*,¹ and the cognate Latin *lilium*² seem to be derived from some Mediterranean language as yet undetermined. Under these circumstances, one naturally thinks of Crete as a possible source for both the *schema* and the word that designates it.³ The Greeks, as we know, preserved in many phases of their dance certain elements which had been Cretan; and, in fact, they looked upon the Cretans as "inventors" of the art of the dance. In particular, many Greek dances which were lively, or spectacular, or ecstatic were said to be of Cretan origin. There seems to be no doubt but that the dances of the Cretans were spirited, and strikingly beautiful to look upon.

Among the Cretans, as Evans and other scholars have demonstrated convincingly, the lily is "preeminently the sacred flower."⁴ It appears, usually in conventionalized fleur-de-lis

¹ Émile Boisacq, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*² (Heidelberg, Winter, 1923), *s. v.*

² A. Walde and J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*³ (Heidelberg, Winter, 1938), *s. v.*

³ Cf. Alice E. Kober on the word *κήρυνθον*, *A. J. P.*, LXIII (1942), pp. 323-4. It may be of some significance that Apollophanes, the writer whom Athenaeus cites as his source on the word, wrote a play called *Kρῆτες*. The scholiast on *Iliad*, XXII, 391 says that one of the Idaean Dactyli was named Krinoeis.

⁴ Arthur J. Evans, *The Palace of Minos* (London, Macmillan, 1921-35), II, pp. 776-7; 792; 473; Martin Möbius, "Pflanzenbilder der Minoischen Kunst in Botanischer Betrachtung," *Jahrb.*, XLVIII (1933), pp. 2-6.

form, on innumerable art objects. It is to be seen on the crown and collar of the Priest-King.⁵ It is offered to the Great Goddess by her votaries,⁶ and the Goddess herself carries it or wears it in her hair.⁷ It is portrayed on rings, on jars, jugs, and vases, on a bronze basin, on an ivory plaque, on a larnax, on the back of a statuette, and on frescoes. In art representations from the mainland of Greece, presumably made under Cretan influence, or even by Cretan artists, it is hardly less frequent. There are lilies in gold foil and in repoussé work, on signet rings and on sword blades; and a stately lady on a fresco from Thebes carries lilies in her hand.⁸

But is there evidence of a "lily" dance figure in Cretan art? We have noted the representations of women bringing lilies to the Goddess. In antiquity, rhythmic processions were regarded as dances; and "offering" dances were not uncommon. In Greek times, dances of young girls who pluck and carry flowers or garlands are abundantly attested, particularly at the Anthesphoria, a spring festival to Persephone (Strabo, 256, 393; Pollux, I, 37; Athenaeus, XII, 554 b); at the Ersantheia (Hesychius, *s. v.*) in the Peloponnesus; at festivals of Hera Antheia (Pausanias, II, 22, 1; Pollux, IV, 78), of Antheia (Hesychius, *s. v.*) or Aphrodite in Crete, etc. Furthermore, the ἀνθεμα, a dance in which two half-choruses approached each other singing ποῦ μοι τὰ ρόδα, ποῦ μοι τὰ ἵα, ποῦ μοι τὰ καλὰ σέλινα; ταῦτα ρόδα, etc. (Athenaeus, XIV, 629 e), is well known. Was the κρίνον, then, a phase of one of these dances, in which young women carried flowers? Probably not, for the κρίνον was but a *schema*, not a whole dance; and if the dancers carried lilies they would probably do so throughout the dance, and not in one figure alone. Besides, our sources mention the κρίνον quite apart from such words as ἀνθεμα, ἀνθεσφόροι, etc., as if it were a separate thing.

On a famous gold ring found at Isopata, in Crete, there is a representation of a ritual dance, performed by three women,

⁵ Evans, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 778, 781, and frontispiece; H. T. Bossert, *The Art of Ancient Crete* (London, Zwemmer, 1937), fig. 255.

⁶ Evans, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 777, 786.

⁷ Evans, *op. cit.*, II, p. 473; A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, II (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1925), p. 49, n. 1.

⁸ Evans, *op. cit.*, II, p. 748 and fig. 483; Bossert, *op. cit.*, fig. 40.

apparently as an invocation of the Great Goddess, who, even as they dance, descends to them. This dance takes place in a field of lilies.⁹ Was the *κρίνον* perhaps an invocation dance of this type, to a Goddess of Flowers, in a field of lilies? Again the fact that the *κρίνον* was but a *schema*, and not a complete dance, presents difficulties.

In the northwestern part of the palace at Cnossus, Sir Arthur Evans found bits of a miniature fresco¹⁰ which proved to be a representation of a ritual dance, performed by women in a theatrical area filled with a gala crowd of excited spectators of both sexes. Mackenzie¹¹ believed that the fresco portrayed a whirling "skirt dance." Evans associated it with the *geranos* and the dance of *Iliad*, XVIII, 590-606; but in those dances both men and women participate, moving in one long line, with hands joined. In the fresco the dancers are all women, and they seem to perform individually, with hands free. Naturally, so fragmentary a painting cannot be pressed too far as evidence. The whole center of the dancing place, in fact, is missing. Nevertheless, the fourteen dancers who remain, on the right side of the composition, do give some indication of a choreographic formation similar to the pattern of a conventionalized lily, as it commonly appears in Cretan art. The Cretan *fleur-de-lis* usually shows two curving volutes to suggest petals, and, between them, at the top, straight lines or dots to suggest stamens. In the alignment of the dancers of the miniature fresco, unmistakably documented by bits of coping, overlapping dresses, etc., the two characteristic volutes are quite clear; and at least one, and possibly three, of the women advance between the volutes to give the "stamen" effect. The whole of the "lily" is seen from the side, and a little aslant. It may be that other groups in the complete picture also formed "lilies"—the field would permit of perhaps three such formations, and the number three seems to have had a special significance in Crete. A pattern of this sort

⁹ Evans, *op. cit.*, III, p. 68 and fig. 38; II, p. 776; Cook, *op. cit.*, II, p. 49 and fig. 21; Bossert, *op. cit.*, fig. 397 f; cf. Sappho, Frag. 114 (Edmonds), and *Homeric Hymn*, XXX, to Ge, 14-15.

¹⁰ Evans, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 66-80, and Pl. XVIII; Mary H. Swindler, *Ancient Painting* (New Haven, Yale Univ. Press, 1929), pp. 82-3, and fig. 156.

¹¹ Duncan Mackenzie, "Cretan Palaces and the Aegean Civilization, II," *B. S. A.*, XII (1905-06), p. 248.

would be best seen by an audience seated a little above the dancers and looking down upon them; and this is exactly the arrangement of most of the spectators in the miniature fresco.

The "lily" *schema*, then, may have been one in which the dancers "made a picture" of a conventionalized lily and stood for a moment in that pattern, so that spectators might see it clearly. Such "pictures" or designs have been very common in group dancing, in all ages; and sometimes the steps of even a single dancer may outline a significant pattern.¹²

If the *κρίνον* was a *schema* of the Cretan dance, it must have been of a religious nature and have been performed in honor of the Great Goddess, to whom the lily was sacred. But where in the Greek dance would such a *schema* probably have been used?

We are told by many authors that in the mysteries at Eleusis,¹³ and even more distinctively at the festival of the Thesmophoria in Greek cities all over the ancient world,¹⁴ choruses of women danced a mimetic enactment of the story of Persephone. These dances, performed in the autumn, were quite distinct from the spring dances of women carrying flowers, performed to Persephone at the Anthespatoria and to other goddesses upon set occasions. The dances of the Eleusinian mysteries and of the Thesmophoria seem to have portrayed, by choreography and gesture, how Persephone plucked flowers with her companions in a green meadow; how she spied a lovely flower (or flowers) apart from the others, and, wandering away, was seized and carried off by Pluto; how her companions, and later her mother, sought her far and wide.¹⁵

¹² See Ted Shawn, *Ruth St. Denis, Pioneer and Prophet* (San Francisco, Nash, 1920), I, p. 31. A part of Miss St. Denis' Radha dance "follows the lines of an open lotus flower, the steps leading from the center of the flower to the point of each petal."

¹³ Lewis R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1896), III, pp. 173-81 and n. 218.

¹⁴ Farnell, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 87, 118. On pp. 326-33 of the same volume, Farnell collects the ancient evidence for the dances at the Thesmophoria. Naturally, Aristophanes in his *Thesmophoriazusae* gives no information on the secret mimetic dances, although lines 947-1000 do accompany a dance.

¹⁵ A "peering" *schema* of Cretan origin probably formed a part of this dance. See Lillian B. Lawler, "The Dance of the Owl," *T. A. P. A.*, LXX (1939), pp. 496-9, and n. 73. Cf. Shawn, *op. cit.*, I, p. 70: "The

Writers who tell the story of the abduction of Persephone usually name the flowers which she was picking at the time. *Homeric Hymn*, II, to Demeter (7-8) mentions, along with other flowers, νάρκισσον and ἵα καλά; and later (425-8) in the same poem Persephone herself names λείρια among the flowers. Columella (X, 270) says "lilia carposit." Claudian (*De Rapt. Pros.*, II, 128-9) says "lilia fuscis intexit violis," and adds, in naming some of the other flowers, "narcissum." There is, then, specific mention of the lily, along with other flowers, in connection with Persephone. The scholiast on Sophocles, *Oed. Col.*, 674 says that the goddess was gathering "narcisos." Diodorus Siculus (V, 3, 2-3) speaks of ἵα among the flowers which are abundant the whole year around in the part of Sicily usually regarded as the locale of the story. Athenaeus, it is interesting to note, identifies νάρκισσος with λείριον (XV, 681 e) and both κρίνον and λείριον with ἵον (681 b).¹⁶

Nilsson¹⁷ has set forth convincingly the probability that there is much that was originally pre-Greek in the cult of Demeter, "the Mother," and Persephone, "the Maid"—in particular, the myth of the abduction of Persephone, and even her very name; and that both the Eleusinian mysteries and the Thesmophoria show Minoan elements. What, then, could be more natural than that a Cretan "lily" dance figure, of ritualistic significance and of spectacular beauty, should appear in a dance connected with such a cult? The appropriateness of the figure is even more conspicuous if Farnell was correct in his conjecture that the lily was a symbol of immortality among the Greeks.¹⁸ It is striking that Evans, on stylistic grounds, connects the miniature

story underlying all Siamese dancing is the great epic story of the Ramayana—the abduction of Sita by Ravar, and her rescue by Rama."

¹⁶ See Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, s. v. "Gartenbau," cols. 770, 792-4. The point is made there that even today white lilies grow wild in great numbers near Henna, in Sicily.

¹⁷ Martin P. Nilsson, *Greek Popular Religion* (New York, Columbia Univ. Press, 1940), pp. 46, 53; *The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion* (New York, Oxford Univ. Press, 1927), pp. 455-6, 487, 490, 505-6. Axel W. Persson (*The Religion of Greece in Prehistoric Times* [Univ. of California Press, 1942], p. 118), and Valentine Müller (*C. W.*, XXXVI [1942], p. 59) believe that the mysteries were post-Mycenaean.

¹⁸ Lewis R. Farnell, "Pausanias V, 11, 1," *C. R.*, IV (1890), pp. 68-9. Cf. Pausanias, V, 22, 5. Cook, *op. cit.*, III, p. 955, n. 1, thinks it merely typified fertility in the vegetable world.

fresco with the designs on the "Ring of Nestor," which he believes (III, pp. 146-57) represent an initiation scene in the Land of the Blest.

In the mystic dances at Eleusis and at the Thesmophoria, the "lily" *schema* may well have been used to symbolize the flowery meadow in which the goddess was seized by Pluto. Such symbolic representations undoubtedly played a large part in Greek mimetic dances, even as they do in the performances of the Chinese theater, to transport the spectators in imagination to the mythological scene. It is interesting to note the insistence upon this same idea of a flowery meadow in, for instance, the songs of the Mystae in the *Frogs* of Aristophanes—cf. lines 351, 373-4, 440-2, 448-53; and 395-6, where they invoke the goddess who "often joins in our dances." Libanius (*On the Dancers*, 116) speaks of the dancer as leading the spectator into flowery meadows and uses the word *ψυχαγωγία*, with all its connotations of the leading of the soul to the realms of the blest. The same author (118) mentions, as characteristic activities of dancers, rapid whirling, sudden stops, and patterns made while the dancers are standing still—as if glued together!

LILLIAN B. LAWLER.

HUNTER COLLEGE.

A NEW READING OF THE GERMANICUS PAPYRUS.

James H. Oliver's recent remark¹ that one short passage in the much discussed edict of Germanicus² had not yet been deciphered, though the writing is perfectly legible, has moved me to attack the puzzle. I have succeeded in reading in lines 42 f.: *τὰ δὲ ἡμέτερα ἐνλογα παρεπ* (όμενά) *ἐστιν τῆς ἑκείνων θεότητος*, which I translate: "The things for which I receive credit are implications of their divinity." The letters ΠΑΡΕΠ and line representing A, written above ΕΠ, were seen by Wilamowitz, as was EN at the beginning of the preceding word. There is an

¹ *A. J. A.*, XLVI (1942), p. 388.

² Published with photograph by Wilamowitz and Zucker in *Berl. Sitzb.*, 1911, pp. 794-821. For the text see *Select Papyri*, with an English translation by A. S. Hunt and C. C. Edgar, in the Loeb Classical Library (Vol. II, pp. 77 f., no. 211).

apex following Ν and another preceding ΙΙ. When the former is read as Λ and the latter is assigned to Α, the intervening letters are easily seen as ΟΓ. I assume that the stroke to the left at the end of ΙΙ indicates an abbreviation. Wilamowitz printed doubtfully ΕΝΥΠΟΠΑΡΕΤΙΑ, but noted that Schubart was not satisfied with the join of ΝΥ. Wilhelm's attempt to interpret this reading as *ἐν ὑποπαραιτίᾳ* (see Liddell-Scott-Jones) is rejected by Wilcken³ for paleographical reasons, along with Crönert's *ἐν συνπηρεσίᾳ* and Schubart's *ἐν νιόν μέρεσίν*. The very divergence of these proposals leads Wilcken to describe the passage as "heillos schwierig." Oliver is satisfied with my solution and has helped me with references and criticism, as has A. D. Nock, but neither is responsible for my final statement.

Tacitus⁴ tells the story of Germanicus' visit to Egypt and of the popularity that he won by distributions of cheap grain and by his unassuming ways. The emperor Tiberius expressed disapproval of his methods of acquiring popularity and rebuked him in the strongest terms for breaking the rule established by Augustus that men of rank should not visit Egypt without permission. In this edict Germanicus deprecates the application to him by popular assemblies of divine appellations, since such terms are appropriate only to the Augusti, Tiberius and Livia. The next two words, which I have read in the papyrus, are both somewhat unusual and require to be interpreted as expressions appropriate to Germanicus. The use of *ἴνλογα*, which for us at least is a nonce word, though Germanicus may have had it from a literary source now lost, is the more difficult, though it is not impossible, to justify. The adjective must be formed from *ἐν λόγῳ* on the analogy of *ἐνδημος*, *ἐνσώματος*, *ἐνδοξός*, and the like. Such an adjective is implied in *ἔλλογέω*, "I set to the account of." Note also *ἔλλόγμος*, "worthy to be held in account." Perhaps Germanicus chose the word for its equivocal force, since, like the English "repute," it could refer both to baseless and to deserved fame—to things that are credited to a man, even when they are not to his credit. The use of *ἐν λόγῳ* for what is notable or creditable is illustrated in Tyrtaeus, Frag. 12, 1-11: *οὐτ' ἀν μησαίμην οὔτ' ἐν λόγῳ ἄνδρα τιθείμην . . . εἰ μὴ τετλαίη μὲν ὄρον φόνον αἷματόεντα κτλ.* In the neuter, used as a noun, *ἴνλογα* means

³ *Hermes*, LXIII (1928), p. 49, n. 1.

⁴ *Annals*, II, 59.

either "the acts reputed mine" or "the acts that bring me repute"; and Germanicus may have chosen the word because it could, but need not, mean both.

We must also take *παρεπόμενα* as a noun with the meaning "logical implications," since as a verb it would govern the dative. "Concomitants" would express the same idea. A. D. Nock's "all that is mine is but a reflection of their divinity"⁵ is very close but lacks the peculiar ingenuity of Germanicus' choice language. Germanicus disclaims divinity for himself but at the same time asserts the divinity of Tiberius. Divinity, however, is more than an empty honor; it implies the obligation to confer benefits and salvation upon mankind. Thus Tiberius finds himself the unwilling recipient of a reputation for kindness that could hardly be repudiated, however expensive it might unfortunately be. Germanicus was evidently a gay comedian who appreciated the spice of life. In the preceding edict he has given us a lively picture of officials at hand when beasts of burden are passing through a city and appropriating them forcibly instead of hiring them from willing owners at the scheduled rate. He cheerfully brands such men as arrant robbers. His frankness and good humor are also strikingly apparent in the final threat of the second edict: "If you will not yield (and desist from your invidious praises), you force me not to show myself often." He has modestly, but not too seriously, striven to divest himself of his popularity and has made it very difficult for Tiberius to resent the cost of that popularity, which fell on him rather than on Germanicus. Oddity of language has made the passage difficult to read, but the oddity of character that the language betokens is all the more interesting. Germanicus was the father of Caligula and the grandfather of Nero.

L. A. Post.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE.

Note on Vol. LXIV, p. 409.

At the end of the first paragraph the words "of Euripides" should be omitted.

G. H. MACURDY.

⁵ C. A. H., X, p. 495.

REVIEWS.

JAKOB COHEN. *Judaica et Aegyptiaca: De Maccabaeorum Libro III Quaestiones Historicae.* Groningen, De Waal, 1941. Pp. viii + 71.

The apocryphal Book III Maccabees has long been a teasing historical puzzle and is likely to remain so for some time until the discovery of new papyri definitely clears up some of the key problems. The book tells how Ptolemy Philopator, after his victory over Antiochus III in the battle of Raphia in 217 B.C., attempted to enter the temple of Jerusalem and, on being miraculously repulsed, returned to Egypt and revenged himself upon the Egyptian Jews by curtailing their civic rights and interfering with their religion. When the Jews refused to register as worshipers of Dionysus, the king ordered that they be bound in the hippodrome of Alexandria and be trampled upon by intoxicated elephants. After several providential delays, the elephants were finally caused by angelic forces to turn upon the persecutors of the Jews, and the repentant king was reconciled with the Jews and allowed them to return to their homes in safety.

A casual reading of this work shows that it contains a liberal amount of apologetic invention similar to the motifs found in II Maccabees and the book of Esther. But that the book has some genuine historical material seems to be indicated by the considerable amount of correct detail concerning the battle of Raphia, the personal traits of Philopator and his devotion to the cult of Dionysus, and the registration of the Jews. At the same time a difficulty arises from the fact that the story of the intoxicated elephants is dated in the reign of Ptolemy Physcon by Josephus in his *Contra Apionem*.

In this compact dissertation Cohen has reviewed the various views of recent scholars since the publication of Israel Abrahams' important article in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* of 1897, and, on the basis of a careful study of the text of several passages and a comparison with other ancient sources and with some recently published inscriptions and papyri, has attempted to give a reasonable solution of the problems connected with the historical background and the date of composition of the book. He has shown himself to be familiar with most recent literature on the subject, including Wallace's relevant article on the census in Egypt in *A.J.P.*, LIX (1938), but strangely enough he seems not to be acquainted with the important contributions of Momigliano, Fruin, and a few other writers on this period of Jewish history.

The chief points made in the dissertation, a few of them original, but most of them re-arguments, are as follows. Ptolemy Philopator attempted to include Jews among those registered for taxation after the battle of Raphia on penalty of reduction to slave status. It was not the Jews of Alexandria or of the Fayum who were chiefly concerned, but the Jews throughout the *chora*. The letter of Ptolemy Philopator in chap. 7 is entirely fictitious. Josephus knew of III

Maccabees but rejected it because it connected the elephant persecution with Philopator instead of Physcon, in whose reign Josephus believed the persecution to have taken place; the elephant story, therefore, is a later incident erroneously combined by the author of III Maccabees with the historically motivated attempt made by Philopator to register the Jews of the *chora* for taxation. The book was composed between 88 and 77 B. C., long enough after the reign of Ptolemy Physcon for confusion to have arisen between his persecution of the Jews and Philopator's. The author of III Maccabees was apparently not acquainted with the Greek version of the Book of Esther, which was brought to Egypt about 77 B. C. as the LXX subscription indicates. Willrich's theory that III Maccabees refers fictionally to the persecution of Gaius is refuted by various arguments, chiefly by the lack of any close resemblance between the book and the known facts of the latter's persecution. Abrahams and Büchler are wrong in limiting the persecution of Philopator to the Jews of the Fayum, and the latter is wrong in connecting the elephants with Philopator rather than with Physcon. Bickermann is wrong in making Philopator's visit to Jerusalem a fictional counterpart to Heliodorus' visit in the time of Seleucus IV, as narrated in II Maccabees. The Egyptian inscription of Philopator, translated and interpreted by Spiegelberg in *Sitzb. Bayer. Akad.*, 1925, shows that Philopator visited the temples in Egypt. Bickermann is also wrong in saying that the Tobias story (told by Josephus in *Ant.*, XIII) makes it improbable that Philopator persecuted the Jews. Heinemann is wrong in denying that the Jews of Egypt were persecuted by any ruler before 88 B. C. Finally, Wallace's suggestion that the Jews were included in the great census of 206/5 B. C. must be modified by making the date 217/16 B. C., as a continuation of the census of 220/19 B. C.

With some of the above arguments the reviewer is in agreement, but he is not convinced by Cohen's rather confident assertion that he has refuted all objections to the historicity of the first part of III Maccabees. It is true that Cohen has added a few bits of new evidence for the apocryphal author's detailed knowledge of the history of Philopator's reign. But this is not sufficient to prove that Philopator actually treated the Jews in the manner described in III Maccabees. In the first place, it cannot be so easily denied that the author of III Maccabees modeled his account of Philopator's visit to the temple in Jerusalem on that of Heliodorus, as related in II Maccabees. In the second place, the Philopator inscription commented on by Spiegelberg does not prove that Philopator entered the Temple of Jerusalem as Cohen claims. If he will read Spiegelberg's article more carefully, he will see that Spiegelberg interprets the passage, "he went to the Temples that were there (in Syria)" to mean the Egyptian temples in Syria; and this interpretation is supported by the context. There are other points in Cohen's argument which seem to the reviewer rather doubtful, such as the assumption that III Maccabees was composed before the Book of Esther was brought to Egypt, but there is not space to argue these matters here. It should be added that of the three Appendices, the first two contain little that is new but the third is a welcome survey of recent discussions of the passage in Josephus, *Ant.*, XIV, 105 ff.,

relating to the Jewish money taken from the Island of Cos by Mithridates in 88 B.C.

In summary, the reviewer, while doubtful of the correctness of some of Cohen's chief contentions, believes that the dissertation is a very creditable one and should be read by all students of Hellenistic Jewish history, and might well be read also by those interested in the Hellenistic period generally.

RALPH MARCUS.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

F. H. COLSON. *Philo with an English Translation. Vol. IX.*
Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press; London, Wm.
Heinemann Ltd., 1941. Pp. x + 547. (*Loeb Classical Library.*)

Although now an octogenarian, Mr. Colson with undiminished vigor and keenness continues his admirable translation and interpretation of Philo. The six treatises included in this volume are, as he remarks in the Preface, very different in nature from those contained in the preceding volumes, which dealt chiefly with the moral and theological interpretation of the Pentateuch. Of the treatises in this volume three are purely philosophical (*Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit*, *De Aeternitate Mundi*, and *De Providentia*); one is historical-biographical (*In Flaccum*); one is an account of the Therapeuts (*De Vita Contemplativa*); and the sixth is chiefly apologetic (*Hypothetica*). In Volume X, partly completed, Colson will translate the remaining treatises preserved in Greek, and in a recently planned eleventh volume the reviewer will translate the works preserved chiefly in Armenian. With the publication of the final volume the Loeb Library will offer the English reader almost every bit of Philo that has survived.

In *Quod Omnis Probus* Philo develops more fully than other ancient writers the Stoic paradox that the wise man alone is free. The fact that in this treatise there is a preponderance of secular over biblical illustrations Colson takes as an indication that it was written in Philo's youth. The work is of special interest because it is one of our few sources of knowledge about the Essenes (probably used by Josephus).

The *De Vita Contemplativa* is stated by Philo himself to be a counterpart to his discussion of the Essenes. Colson makes the interesting suggestion (p. 106, note) that the *D. V. C.* is the second half of a tract on both the practical and contemplative lives, and that the first half of this compound work is not the *Quod Omnis Probus*, as is generally assumed, or the *Hypothetica*, but a lost treatise "which insisted on the practical aspect of the Essene community more strongly than either of the extant narratives." This theory is plausible if we assume further that the work is Philonic without any doubt. It is reassuring to have so expert a Philonist as Colson add his testimony to that of Conybeare and Wendland in defense of the Philonic authorship of this treatise.

The authorship of the *De Aeternitate Mundi* and the central thesis

of the work are even more problematical. Throughout his writings Philo pretty consistently maintains that the Cosmos is *γενητὸς καὶ ἄφθαρτος*. The author of the *De Aet. M.* seems to argue, in opposition to the Stoics, that the world is uncreated and indestructible. At least there are a few passages to that effect, but in none of them is it quite certain whether the author is giving his own or an opponent's view. In one passage (§ 18) he reports that Hesiod and Moses "the lawgiver of the Jews" consider the world created and indestructible, but he does not clearly state his approval of this view, as one would expect a devout follower of Moses to do, and as Philo actually does elsewhere. The reviewer is somewhat hesitant about accepting Colson's suggestion (p. 177) that the author's sympathies "are with Plato, who, he says, meant what he says, viz. that it [the Cosmos] is *γενητὸς καὶ ἄφθαρτος* in the sense of *φθαρτὸς ἀλλ' οὐ φθαρησόμενος*." Since the treatise is almost wholly concerned with the future destructibility or indestructibility of the Cosmos and not with its origin, the reviewer is more inclined to accept Colson's further suggestion that the only subject treated in either half of the essay was the controversy between the Stoics and Peripatetics, "any third hypothesis being ignored for the occasion." If we make this assumption, the Philonic authorship of the treatise is less problematic. It seems to the reviewer that Colson would have done well to give a more detailed refutation of Bernays' arguments for the non-Philonic authorship of the *De Aet. M.*, even though, as he points out, those arguments are rather lacking in definiteness. For example, there might have been some discussion of the statement in § 62 about the purification of the earth by the overflow of rivers, "as they say is the case in Egypt." This reads like the statement of someone living outside Egypt. But perhaps it would be explained by Colson as the paraphrase of an argument made by another author quoted by Philo. At any rate, if we assume the Philonic authorship of this work, we may safely make the further assumption that part of the treatise has been lost and that in the lost part Philo argued, against both Stoics and Peripatetics, that the Cosmos was created and indestructible.

In his notes and appendices to the *In Flaccum*, the treatise recently edited by Box with a detailed commentary, Colson is obliged by lack of space to deal only passingly with various problems connected with the civic status of the Jews in Alexandria, although a considerable literature on this subject has arisen in recent years. But he has succeeded in maintaining a judicious attitude on the whole toward questions which he candidly admits to having studied only casually. The reviewer, however, must dissent from Colson's opinion (p. 301) that Philo "gloats over the misery of Flaccus in his fall, exile and death." It would seem rather that Philo shows moral restraint in his admittedly rhetorical account of the wretched Flaccus' misfortunes.

The fourth section of the volume consists of two long fragments from Eusebius, cited under the name of Philo's *Hypothetica* and *Apology for the Jews*, apparently the same work, which may further be identical with the Philonic work which Eusebius refers to as *Peri Ioudaion*. The first part of the first extract is a rationalistic history of the Mosaic period; the second part is a sketch of the Mosaic constitution, similar to that given by Josephus in his *Contra Apionem*, and at the same time partly supplementary, partly contradictory, to

the account of Mosaic legislation given by Philo in *De Specialibus Legibus* and *De Virtutibus*. The second extract concerns the Essenes and is much the same as the description of that sect given in *Quod Omnis Probus* (cf. *D. V. C.* and *De Spec. Leg.*). There are several problems raised by these tantalizingly incomplete extracts, which Colson unfortunately had not space to discuss in full. In this connection the reviewer wishes to call attention to Colson's note (p 409), "There seems to me to be a remarkable similarity between the *Hypothetica* and the *Contra Apionem* on many points. See notes. I do not know whether this has been taken into account by scholars in discussing Josephus' possible indebtedness to Philo. Thackeray, who notes resemblances in his preface to the translation of the *Antiquities* . . . says nothing about it in his few lines of preface to the *Apion*." Colson will be glad to learn that a similar conclusion was reached by S. Belkin in *The Alexandrian Halakah in Apologetic Literature of the First Century C. E.* (Philadelphia, 1936). The genuineness of the *Hypothetica* and its relation to the *De Spec. Leg.* seem to the reviewer, however, to be problems requiring further study.

The last of the treatises translated in this volume is that portion of the Greek text of the *De Providentia* preserved by Eusebius from the second book (the first book is extant only in Armenian). As Colson points out, there is nothing in this work to indicate that the writer is a Jew except the reference in § 64 to his visit to "the ancestral temple" in Jerusalem, and yet the thought and language are clearly Philonic, as Wendland has shown and as Colson further demonstrates in several notes. He suggests that, like the *Quod Omnis Probus* and *De Aet. M.*, the *De Providentia* may be an early work of Philo, written before he had begun systematically to interpret the Pentateuch.

In conclusion, the reviewer must again congratulate Colson on his fine and useful translation and express appreciation of the many subtle observations on Philo's style and manner of thought. The appendices also furnish welcome and concise information about a variety of matters.

RALPH MARCUS.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. LI. Pp. 335. Athenian Studies Presented to William Scott Ferguson (*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Supplementary Volume I). Pp. 535. Cambridge, Harvard Univ. Press, 1940.

This duality of volumes is a happy solution of the Festschrift problem. The regular issue of the *Harvard Studies* is dedicated to Professor Ferguson, contains his photograph and bibliography, and is confined to articles written by his pupils, with one exception. The *Athenian Studies* contains twenty-one articles contributed by his colleagues in various parts of the world, all but one of which are concerned with problems of Athenian history. As all but two of Professor Ferguson's pupils are represented in the one, so in the other appear most of the names one would look for. In general, a

reviewer is glad to note that there have been avoided the two major dangers of this type of publication, an unrepresentative group of contributors and an *ad hoc* group of contributions. The authors seem to have been little restricted in length, and many of the individual papers are substantial contributions in their field. All in all, the editors and the Harvard Department of Classics alike may legitimately feel that their desire to do honor to one of the great scholars and teachers of our generation has been not unworthily fulfilled.

The arrangement of the *Athenian Studies* is chronological, and properly Blegen's "Athens and the Early Age of Greece" heads it off. This is one of those immensely serviceable reports of progress and estimates of results which specialists are often reluctant to make. Blegen's admirable conservatism is a guarantee against radical theorizing. His conclusions are not revolutionary. He favors Nilsson's derivation of Athena from the Minoan palace goddess, and regards Athens as an intermediary between Crete and the Greek mainland in the first half of the second millennium B. C. Later, in the period of the sea-power of the cities of the Argolid, Athens was somewhat isolated. This was when the Achaean invasion supplanted the Ionian domination in Greece. After the Dorians arrived, Athens recovered and in the seventh century was the brilliant center which recent excavations have revealed, a brilliance foreshadowed by the development in the Late Mycenaean period of a distinctive Attic style in that milieu which was to be her later glory, pottery.

Mylonas, in an article entitled "Athens and Minoan Crete," takes a somewhat different approach. He regards the background of the Theseus myth as post-Homeric and takes it as a reflection of conditions, not before the arrival of the Achaeans, but after the Dorian conquest of Crete, in the times of Idomeneus and his successors. Demeter did not come from Crete, and her claim to have done so is to be taken no more seriously than that of Odysseus. Neither was Athena Cretan. Her victory over Posidon took place in the 14th or 13th century, and Athens never experienced a Cretan domination. *Historici certant*, and it is perhaps wiser not to be too sure even of negative conclusions. Myths, however late in appearing, are generally based on something, and the more fantastic they are, the older they may be. Lionel Pearson (*The Local Historians of Attica* [Monograph Series of the American Philological Association, XI, 1942], pp. 18 f.) likewise favors a fifth century date for the popularization of Theseus, against H. Herter (*Rh. Mus.*, LXXXV [1936] and LXXXVIII [1939]) but refrains from drawing such far-reaching conclusions from it.

Daux, "Athènes et Delphes," sketches the political and spiritual rivalry of the two cities from Cylon to Demetrius and points out that, while a rival, Athens acted as a wonderful publicity agent for Delphi in the fifth century, and through the Drama contributed essentially to the ethical side of Apollo's cult. In an Appendix, Daux presents a list of Delphian inscriptions from the sixth to the first centuries which mention Athenian *hieromnemones*, *proxenoi*, and dedicants.

McGregor, "The Pro-Persian Party at Athens from 510 to 480 B. C.," reargues without additional evidence this somewhat fruitless question. He comes to the estimable conclusion that there were no

traitors and no party polities at Athens in war time and follows Hudson in doubting the historicity of the shield-signal.

Peek, "Die Kämpfe am Eurymedon," contests Uxkull's theory of a dual tradition concerning the events of Cimon's greatest triumph, one represented by Thucydides, according to which the land battle preceded the sea battle, and the other, with a reversed order, represented by Diodorus and Plutarch, which can be traced back through Ephorus to Ctesias. His argument is convincing, but I do not know that anyone, except possibly Ehrenberg, has taken Uxkull seriously. The "Cyprus" epigram (Diodorus, XI, 62, 3, and elsewhere) has nothing to do with the Eurymedon. In conclusion Peek advances a new restoration of the Maeandrius epigram from the Heraeum in Samos. It is an improvement on both Wilamowitz and Wade-Gery, with an easier word-order and thought, but fails to solve the riddle which Peek himself poses, how can Maeandrius be said to have captured the hostile ships when they were sunk? This may be merely an undue logical requirement, but it must be noted that while *ὑπεδέξατο πόντος* seems to make it clear that they were sunk ἔλευ is a restoration. Also I cannot quite accept [*πάσας δ' αὐτάδροις ἀλλὰ τὰς ὑπεδέξατο πόντος κρυφθείσας*] as intelligible Greek. If *τὰς* is a relative, we need another verb.

Wade-Gery, "The Peace of Kallias," in a masterly article, undertakes a rehabilitation of this event, which has been regarded with great scepticism by modern historians. It was reported by Ephorus, doubted by Theopompos. Thucydides makes no mention of it, Isocrates believed it, Callisthenes is reported to have denied the treaty but to have accepted the observance of the terms by the King of Persia. Wade-Gery would reconstruct the background of Isocrates' faith and Theopompos' doubt in a publication on stone about 380, not of the original treaty with Artaxerxes, but of the renewal text with Darius. This was the fruit of the embassy in 424/3 of Epilycus, Andocides' uncle, and lies back of the Callias decree concerning the Nike priesthood of the same year. The terms he would interpret in somewhat modern political conceptions. It was primarily a non-aggression treaty; Asia Minor was demilitarized from the Halys to the coast, and the waters west of Lycia (possibly also west of Byzantium, with the stipulation that no Athenian fleet might enter the Black Sea). The cities were to be autonomous, but tribute-paying. This was presumably in 449, if Cimon's ostracism lasted from 461 to 451, and the expedition to Cyprus took place the following summer. This treaty ended the war with Persia, for which the Hellenic League had been formed, and Pericles acted swiftly. Before the end of the Attic year a congress had been summoned, and, when Sparta's refusal had doomed any joint action, Athens went ahead alone. The tribute for 449/8 was canceled, but then the hegemonic city took her own steps to fulfill the League's purposes, to rebuild the temples, to continue the festivals, and to police the seas. The League was transformed into an Empire, weights and measures were standardized, and the tribute was resumed. It may be that Pericles observed the treaty, although his trip to the Black Sea is questionable. After his death the assessment of Cleon went further than it allowed, and in the 'teens, the support of Amorges and the presence of Athenian troops in Ephesus must have served to throw

Darius into the arms of Sparta. Probably no tribute was paid the King after 415; these were the arrears which Tissaphernes was to collect. In the treaties of 411, recorded by Thucydides, Asia Minor was remilitarized; "concerning his own territory the King may plan as he wishes," and this was effected in 407 when Cyrus came down as *karanos*. But the original idea persisted. Tithraustes in 395 offered to return to its terms, however insincerely. And with the Antalcidas treaty, the King had the satisfaction of applying the same conception to Greece itself. The cities should be autonomous; thus were the hegemonies to be served as Persia had been served in 449. This reconstruction gives a continuity to Greek relations with their great Iranian neighbor, but it is possible, perhaps, to speculate further. We know little of the feelings of the little people through all this. Certainly the Anatolian cities, Miletus notably, were poorly off in the first half of the fifth century. If, after the Callias treaty, they regained freedom of commercial relations with their hinterland, while remaining relatively free from political obligations in either direction, a reason would be seen for their economic recovery and later prosperity. Can the lesson have been lost upon their contemporaries across the Aegean? Certainly the leading motive of fourth century politics, beneath the seemingly meaningless and endless struggle for hegemony among the great powers, is a search for a peace formula, the *koine eirene* which is as constant a phrase in the recurring conferences and congresses as it appeared impossible of realization in practice.

Dinsmoor, "The Tribal Cycles of the Treasurers of Athena," carries back the tribal rotation to 447/6. (May this too be one of the many innovations of the New Order in the eventful year of 449/8?) An interruption occurs between 429 and 411 (an effect of the plague, possibly, and of a return to the ancestral constitution under the Five Thousand?), and a disturbance in 377/6, when, as a result of the fire mentioned by Demosthenes, the regular board was impeached and a second appointed. Forward rotation of the tribes began in 352. A new restoration is advanced for I. G., I², 255a, and the Erechtheum fragments are redated: XXIX to 407/6, XXVII to 406/5 (the year of Xenophon's fire), XXVIII to 405/4. I. G., II², 120 is dated to 353/2, showing that a cycle began in 362/1. Thus the "Ferguson Law" continues to be extended.

Thompson, "A Golden Nike from the Athenian Agora," publishes a bronze head of a girl of the 'thirties of the fifth century, and shows that it belonged to a winged figure of about half life-size. It had been gilded at first, then, after the gold had been removed, was silvered and again gilded. In an admirably cautious discussion, the possibility is developed and made very probable that it actually was one of the three famous Nikai of 434, covered each with two talents of gold. Denuded after 406, the head was carefully preserved, and the whole may have been restored less expensively in 336.

Gomme, "The Old Oligarch," devotes a sensible and penetrating article to the enigmatic *Athenaion Politeia* preserved in the corpus of Xenophon, which all agree belongs to the period of the Peloponnesian War. I should accept entirely his explanation of its paradoxical character: "I, an Athenian oligarch, addressing my fellow oligarchs elsewhere, will yet defend the Athenian democracy." The

first part consists of generalizations, the second part is specific. The emphasis is on the essential unity of democratic Athens, and the final section is important. The dissident oligarchs found very little support. Gomme suggests a date in the five years after 420. There is little positive evidence either way, but I should still favor a date in the late 'twenties, possibly about 424, once proposed, I believe, by Meritt.

Meritt, "Athens and Carthage," publishes a new fragment of *I. G.*, I², 47, and restores both fragments. While much remains tentative, it is clear that Athens was engaged in negotiations with Carthage in 406, presumably for an alliance which would relieve her at least to the extent of any danger from Syracusan contingents in the East.

Finley, "The Unity of Thucydides' History," offers first fruits from his more recently published volume on the author. He establishes, without much difficulty, that Thucydides' leading ideas and point of view (especially the "paradoxical" attitude) are similar in the sixth and seventh books and in the early part of the *History*. From this he would argue a unity of composition, in the sense that the *History* as a whole was composed at one time. I doubt if any reader of Thucydides fails to be conscious of a single point of view. As to the unity of composition, however, that is still a question. Must a consummate artist and a profound thinker write all in one burst in order to be consistent?

Bonner, "The Use of Hemlock for Capital Punishment," argues in a brief note that the Thirty cannot have introduced the hemlock, as claimed by Lipsius, for it was already known to Aristophanes in the *Frogs*. The execution of Polemarchus and Theramenes by this means does not show that it was their accustomed form of execution; cudgeling was used for traitors.

Bloch, "Studies in Historical Literature of the Fourth Century B. C.," begins with an examination of the *Hellenica* of Oxyrhynchus. After a survey of the various theories which have been advanced concerning its authorship, summarized in a two-page table which shows graphically the utter lack of agreement which exists among scholars, he advances a new argument which eliminates all known historians from consideration: Dionysius of Halicarnassus stated that no author followed Thucydides in his division of material into winter and summer campaigns, and in the controversy which followed among ancient critics none corrected him in this. That is to say, the author of the *Hellenica* was unknown to Dionysius and his contemporaries. Having established this point, Bloch proceeds to examine the arguments against individual claimants. Theopompus is eliminated on stylistic grounds. His ornamentation ($\psi\chi\rho\tau\eta\varsigma$) is utterly different from the barren simplicity of the Oxyrhynchus Historian. Ephorus was eliminated by Barber's discovery that he used the O. H., while Diodorus used him. As the O. H. was not an Attidographer, he cannot have been Androtion. Finally Bloch shows, by another table, the number of unknown authors and works which have turned up at Oxyrhynchus. It was a considerable literary center, witness Heraclides Lembus the Oxyrhynchite, and of the number of authors and texts available in Egypt witness Athenaeus the Deipnosophist. That "a library is a stimulus to scholarship" was true in Alexandria as

elsewhere, and some student of Oxyrhynchus had sent in to "Town" to have copied an obscure fourth century author, probably available nowhere else.

In two shorter sections, Bloch discusses Androtion and the *Laws* of Theophrastus. The former he identifies with the statesman (so now also Pearson), and finds in his account of the *seisachtheia* an expression of the middle-of-the-road democracy which he had inherited from Theramenes. Of the *Laws*, he would recognize a hitherto unnoticed fragment in an Aristophanes scholium, wherein the decline of ostracism is ascribed to the "feebleness" of Athenian democracy in the late fifth century. This is a form of expression which appears also in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (I, 4, 1360 a 25). It is remarkable that there are no references to the *Laws* in Aristotle's *Politics*. These were apparently not based on the work of the pupil, which was not far enough advanced in Aristotle's late years to be quoted. On the other hand, the section in the *Constitution of Athens* on the operation of the law courts shows that the collection of material for the *Laws* was, in great part at least, already made.

Woodward, "Two Attic Treasure-Records," identifies a stone in the British Museum, *I. G.*, II², 1414, as the lower part of II², 1407, known only from a copy by Chandler, and restores in part with a 118-letter line. This is the inventory for 385/4 B. C. of the Treasurers of Athena. Of the other inventories of this period, 1412, 1413, and 1415 belong to the years 384/3 to 374/3, with 1415 the latest; 1412 may be dated 382/1. In the second half of the article, Woodward re-edits *I. G.*, II², 1455 of 341/0 with new readings and restorations, including a bit of the reverse face which the *Editio Minor* found illegible.

Jaeger, "The Date of Isocrates' *Areopagiticus* and the Athenian Opposition," analyzes the speech to determine its date. Isocrates is not yet despairing of restoring the empire, and Athens' state is slipping, not fallen. Consequently the speech comes between the *Panegyricus* and the *Peace*. Athens' domination might be retained provided her constitution was revamped in a more conservative way, the way of the *patrios politeia*, of the moderate democrats, Aristides, Thucydides, Theramenes, and Isocrates' own pupil, Timotheus. This can only be before the Social War,—perhaps, if the second assistance of a Theban ally to which he refers was the expedition to Euboea in 357, the latter part of that year. Thus the speech has real political content and a real political purpose. We should take more seriously the report that Theramenes was Isocrates' teacher.

Westermann, "Athenaeus and the Slaves of Athens," examines Athenaeus' second-hand account of the 400,000 slaves at Athens in the time of Demetrius of Phalerum and finds it exaggerated. By marshaling the literary tradition and the evidence of the inscriptions, he attempts to find approximate figures. Nicias had many slaves, but he was exceptional. Lysias' father had 120, Demosthenes' 53, the Cripple none. Some of the property inventories list no slaves, but the inference from the Comedy and from chance statements like that of Xenophon at the beginning of the *Cyropaedia* suggests that they were numerous. Westermann thinks that they may have formed one-quarter to one-third of the whole population, averaging slightly more than one to a family. That is certainly conservative.

Flacelière, "Les Rapports d'Athènes et de l'Aitolie au III^e Siècle avant J. C." points out that hostility to Macedon brought the foreign policy of Athens and Aetolia into frequent agreement during this period. Only when Athens was under the domination of a Macedonian (Cassander, Demetrius, and then Antigonus and his successors until 229) did their ways run counter to each other. This unity of point of view he would piously ascribe to a feeling of democratic solidarity against foreign aggression, but there seem to be other elements in the picture. The two states usually coöperated badly. Aside from the periods when they came to actual hostilities, as in the Demetrian War, Aetolia failed to support Athens in the Chremonidean War, and Athens Aetolia in the Social War. Perhaps they were no better friends than great powers have been before and since, and their common action was hindered by jealousy. This feeling might account for the lack of any Athenian *hieromnemon* in the decade following the freeing and neutrality of the city in 229.

Tarn, "Phthia-Chryseis," returns to the old problem of the maternity of Philip V. His mother, the consort of Demetrius, is called Phthia in official texts, but Chryseis in the literary tradition. The latter-named woman married Antigonus Doson on his accession, and Dow and Edson in a recent article have established reasonably well that she was Philip's mother. On the other hand, Demetrius married the daughter of Olympias of Epirus, named Phthia in the tradition, in 240/39, and Philip was born in 238/7 with a most un-Antigonid-like disposition. All this leads Tarn to suggest now that Phthia and Chryseis are one and the same person, Phthia surnamed "Goldilocks."

Kirchner, "Archon Diomedon," contributes a note on one of the oldest *cruces* in the field of Athenian chronology. He is convinced, and his opinion is confirmed by Leonards and Klaffenbach, that the critical letter in *I. G.*, II², 791, the initial letter in the demotic of Diomedon's secretary, is *lambda*, i. e. Λ[ευκονοεύς, as Lolling. Accepting Meritt's 1938 dating of Polyeuctus in 243/2 as definitive, he decides for two archons named Diomedon, one following Polyenetus and Hiero in 241/0, and a second, with the secretary Phoryscides of Leuconoe, as successor to Cydenor in 230/29, and goes so far as to construct a family tree for Phoryscides. But this is a ticklish field. Two studies of the archon list have appeared since Kirchner wrote, Dinsmoor's *Athenian Archon List in the Light of Recent Discoveries* (1939) and Pritchett-Meritt, *Chronology of Hellenistic Athens* (1940). These disagree on other matters but agree that Polyeuctus does not belong to 243/2. Both accept Oliver's confirmation of Johnson's reading of the initial letter of Phoryscides' demotic as *alpha*, hence (Pritchett-Meritt) Α[ναγνώστος. Both accept the sequence Polyeuctus-Hiero-Diomedon, but Dinsmoor dates it 248/7-246/5, Pritchett-Meritt 249/8-247/6. Neither feels the need of more than one Diomedon. Some points are still obscure, especially what becomes now of Robert's discovery that Polyeuctus' incumbency fell in part at least in the reign of Seleucus II.

Robert, "'Αμφιθαλῆς," presents the only article in the volume which does not deal with Athens, a promised study of Attic festivals not having become ready in time. This word occurs in inscriptions as an adjective meaning children "with both parents living," but

more commonly as a noun in connection with festivals, where it has the meaning "bearer of the sacred branch" or "foliage." Possibly "bedecked" was the original notion.

Oliver, "Julia Domna as Athena Polias," adds a newly discovered fragment to *I. G.*, II², 1076, and edits the text with photograph, drawing, and restoration. It appears now that Julia Domna was worshipped as Athena Polias in the state cult.

With this ends the *Athenian Studies*. Although the editors have arranged the articles in the *Harvard Studies* volume impartially in alphabetical order, it will be convenient to survey them chronologically.

Larsen, "The Constitution and Original Purpose of the Delian League," would see a continuity of political conception throughout the middle of the fifth century. The Delian League continued the Hellenic League even in name, only that the hegemony was passed like a liturgy to Athens. The organization was originally that of a permanent free symmachy. War between members and secession were forbidden, but only the predominant power of the hegemon brought about the subjugation of revolting members and the interference in their internal government. The turning point came with the dismissal of Cimon from Ithome; and with the Thirty Years Peace, Sparta practically accepted the Delian League as an *hegemonia* parallel to the Peloponnesian. The old hope and promise of peace among the Greeks, the most promising which Greece ever knew, was at an end.

Smith, "The Economic Motive in Thucydides," studies motivation in general in the historian; this he finds to be largely in the form of universals in the fifth century manner, expressed easily in the form of *gnomai*. The economic motive is not prominent, or, at least, does not go beyond a kind of fiscal sense. Thucydides "went at least a little way beyond rudimentary generalizations," but he has little or no conception of "strategic materials." The Athenians went to Sicily, according to Alcibiades speaking in Sparta, to subjugate the peoples there and in Italy, and to procure money (for mercenaries), grain, and timber for an attack on the Peloponnesian from the west. This is hardly geopolitics, but it might be fairer to say that the simpler pattern of ancient life and ancient warfare let the problem be handled in such terms.

Pusey, "Alcibiades and τὸ φιλόπολι," in a highly unsatisfactory article, argues that the Greeks, including the Athenians, lacked any sense of city patriotism, and Alcibiades' embarrassment was unnecessary (or else he was not embarrassed). It is not hard to make up a list of persons in the fifth century and earlier who welcomed foreign aid against the party in power in their city, but that is only to recognize that patriotism is a subjective matter in any specific instance. Will one argue that the modern world has no conception of patriotism because numerous governments in exile are hoping to be reinstated by force of foreign arms, or because Frenchmen fought Frenchmen in Syria or Morocco? It may be that Thrasybulus and Critias differed extremely over the foreign and domestic policy which Athens should follow, but I have no doubt that both, if asked, would have claimed to be acting from patriotic motives. If anything, it was an age when there was too much patriotism.

Schlaifer, "Notes on Athenian Public Cults," calls attention to

two new instances of publicly supported cults at Athens, a five per cent for Theseus (the *ἀποφορά* paid by the Phylatids? Nock), and a one per cent perhaps paid by everybody for Asclepius, and then proceeds to a series of disconnected notes, directed mainly against Pritchett, who has replied in part in *A.J.P.*, LXII (1941), p. 359. He discusses the problem of the priests of the *eponymi* who do not come from the tribe concerned, concluding that these were old cults with gentile priests before the tribes were formed (but there are exceptions, as he observes, and the result is not very satisfactory). Finally he tries his hand at the Nike inscription *I.G.*, I², 24, returning to Koerte's old restoration *Ηιππόνιος* and regarding the text as a complete decree. I doubt if his theory will stand; cf. Meritt's reply in *Hesperia*, X, p. 307. In any case, *Ηιππόνιος* seems definitely out. There is full support for Dinsmoor's *Γλαῦκος*.

Dow, "The First Eneéteric Delian Pythais," re-edits with the addition of new fragments *I.G.*, II², 2326, and promises a commentary and discussion later.

Edson, "Macedonica," presents certain Reisefrüchte with his customary caution and accuracy. A dedication of Philip V reveals the cult of Heracles Cynagedas at Pella, and at Thessalonica new texts make possible a better understanding of the inscription put together by Robert in the *Études Anatoliennes*, p. 448, no. 3. The cults revealed are the following: Augustus, Rome and the Roman Benefactors, Zeus Eleutherius and Rome, and the Twelve Gods. There remains Pelekides' Deus Fulvus, whose human prototype Edson would plausibly find in the deceased son of Antoninus Pius, M. Aurelius Fulvus Antoninus. Pelekides' objection to this is not compelling, although there still remains the question why this deification should have taken place in Macedonia and nowhere else.

Brady, "A Head of Sarapis from Corinth," is inspired by the new discovery to re-examine the known heads for traces of gilding, and comes to the conclusion that they were all gilded, contrary to the usual opinion. The statements of Clement and others misled Ameling into thinking that the Sarapis statues were of a blue-black color appropriate to an infernal deity.

Cram, "The Roman Censors," in an interesting article, gives a list of the known censors of the Republic and analyzes the *gentes censoriae* in contrast with the *gentes consulares*. In the earliest period, down to 286, the office seems not to have been popular with the great families. Then follows the period of the "great censorships" down to 133, when the censorships and consulships show a similar distribution. From then on until 80, there was a great increase in plebeian censors, but in the next fifty years the patrician influence revives.

Seramuzza, "Claudius Soter Euergetes," takes as his text part of the proclamation of Paullus Fabius Persicus to the communities of Asia and gives excerpts from his recent book on the Emperor to show Claudius' benefactions and the provincials' gratitude. It is a formidable list of *testimonia*, even for a reign of fourteen years.

Hammond, "Septimius Severus, Roman Bureaucrat," examines the career of this disputed personality to check the "current opinion" that he was ignorant of Roman institutions and unsympathetic with them, and based his power on the army and the knights. The last is

correct, but the former is refuted by his long senatorial career under Marcus, in which he commanded legions at times but fought them little or none and had no fame as a general. "Septimius' own training was that of a lawyer, not a soldier . . . he was a typical product of the second century, a Roman bureaucrat."

Boak, "Some Early Byzantine Tax Records from Egypt," publishes four more papyri from the archives of Aurelius Isidorus at Karanis. Earlier texts appeared in the *Études de Papyrologie* from 1933. They belong to the early 'teens of the fourth century, and give some information on the economic and administrative conditions of the time. The first is a list of *κεφαλαιωταί* of Karanis, persons designated by the comarchs with tax responsibilities. Column II of the same sheet contains two receipts for delivery of barley by the comarchs to various boats. The second, and so probably the first also, is an original, written on the same piece of papyrus by the ship-captain himself. The next text is a résumé of both transactions addressed to one Heraclius, a purchasing agent, and an acknowledgement that they have been paid. It is presumably a retained copy. The transaction as a whole is of some interest, for Heraclius seems to have been purchasing barley for the remount service in Alexandria. The remaining texts comprise a list of tax assignments, with an obiter dictum complaining of the comarchs, and a report of grain collections by the sitologi. This is of interest primarily for the item which Boak refers to as *τὸ πιστικού*, but which appears only in the genitive in the text (*eis δὲ λόγον πιστικού(v)*). The word occurs only in this transaction, for the two receipts published in the *Études de Papyrologie*, V, nos. 24 and 25 (where the spelling is *πιστίκιον*) cover the items of this account. It is a puzzle. Boak, with Bell's concurrence, would connect it with the word *πιστικός*, which is used commonly in very late texts meaning "trusted agent." Some of these *πιστικοί* are concerned with taxes, and so Boak thinks of tax grain of some sort, grain relating to the *πιστικοί*. This seems unlikely, the more so as the *πιστικοί* do not appear for two hundred years after this. The *πιστικού* is measured in pounds as well as artabae, and the weight, one hundred pounds per artaba, is well enough for wheat. On the other hand, wheat is not normally weighed, and I wonder if it must be wheat at all. The weight may be a bar, but otherwise I should like to suggest that *πιστικού* may be a misspelling for *πιστάκιον*.¹ Pistache nuts are not mentioned in the papyri, to

¹ The same identification is proposed, with more confidence than I feel, by H. R. W. Smith in *A.J.A.*, XLVI (1942), p. 585. His reference to actual grains of *pistacia vera* found at Karanis (identified by H. H. Bartlett; cf. A. E. R. Boak, *Karanis* [1933], p. 88) was one which I had missed and it establishes the production in Egypt. The difficulty in the present instance lies in the weight, for pistachio nuts are light. It is reasonable to suppose that the identification was considered and rejected by Professor Boak.

From its verbal similarity, *πιστικού—πιστάκιον* (= *πιστάκιον?*) suggests the fourth-century term *πιστάκιον*, used of "an agricultural firm which cultivates government land under a system of lease and sublease" (H. C. Youtie, *T.A.P.A.*, LXXIII [1942], p. 75), the etymology of which has never, I believe, been satisfactorily explained. The phrase *eis λόγον πιστικού* could be as well resolved "for the account of the

my knowledge, but they were grown in Syria and Arabia, and they were well known in Egypt as an article of food. Witness Athenaeus, XIV, 659 e. I do not think it impossible that a local attempt may have been made to grow them in the Fayum at this time.²

Blake, "Some Byzantine Accounting Practices Illustrated from Georgian Sources," studies the list of benefactors in a liturgical manuscript from Iviron, the Georgian monastery at Athos, to collect the evidence concerning coinage, property, and values in the eleventh century. He finds that debasement of the coinage began under Constantine Ducas. Gifts to the monastery included food, ecclesiastical properties, boats and draft animals, and money, measured in pounds or drakhani or perperay (gold coins of Alexius Comnenus, first issued in 1083). "Name" coins include Ducatae, Rhomanatae, Ducamichaelatae, and Botoneiatae.

The volume concludes with an account of Robert L. Stroock, a gifted pupil of Ferguson's who died in Athens, and an excerpt from an unpublished paper of his on "History and Value." At the end are summarized the dissertations of the department for 1939/40.

C. BRADFORD WELLES.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

S. F. BONNER. *The Literary Treatises of Dionysius of Halicarnassus*.

Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan Co., 1939.

Pp. vii + 108. \$2.00.

This volume is the fifth of the *Cambridge Classical Studies*. The author's main contention is "that there is noticeable throughout the literary treatises of Dionysius a gradual but distinct improvement in thoroughness of critical exposition." The proof of this contention clearly depends upon a) a reasonable degree of certainty concerning the dates at which these treatises were composed, and b) convincing evidence that the later treatises show the required improvement.

The arguments and deductions upon which Bonner bases his assumed order of composition can produce, as he himself admits (p. 25), nothing more than a "strong probability"; and since the order so assumed does not closely resemble the conjectural orders adopted by others, e. g. Sandys and Roberts, both of whom put the *De Compositione Verborum* in the second instead of in the fifth place, it seems to me highly unlikely that reasonable certainty in this respect can now or ever be attained. Furthermore, when we

firm" as "for the account of the grain" (or whatever commodity it may be). That possibility, likewise, must have been considered and discarded by Boak.

² It has been plausibly conjectured that the tree was introduced in Egypt in the third century B.C. Cf. M. Wellmann, "Die Georgika des Demokritos," *Abh. Berl. Akad.*, 1921, No. 4; M. Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (1941), pp. 357, 1610. Confirmation from the papyri is still lacking. A variety of pistachio (*pistacia Khinjuk* Stocks) grows wild in Egypt today (cf. *Annalen des K. K. Naturhistorischen Hofmuseums* [Vienna], XXVII [1913], pl. IV, 6), and I am informed by Dr. Norman H. Giles, Jr. of the Yale Department of Botany that other varieties are cultivated there.

remember the fluctuations that can be observed in the quality of work turned out by men of undoubted genius, we can see that such steady progress on the part of any critic would be surprising. In the case of Dionysius, there is some evidence that his critical powers declined.

Most of the manuals rate the *De Thucydide* as one of the later essays. As Saintsbury said, in this study the desire of Dionysius "to dust the varlet's jacket" is evidently not merely superior but anterior to any desire whatsoever to criticise varlet or jacket on the merits of either." Bonner refers (p. 99), with excessive gentleness, to the "misguided judgments" arising from the application of rhetorical principles to an author of a totally different genre, when what is really present is the arrogant folly of a rhetorician who imagined that he was a better historian than Thueydides. Just below (p. 103), Bonner recurs to his thesis and discovers in this same essay "the most thorough investigation into the style and subject-matter of any one author yet criticised . . . the method of recasting, always a good indication of the effort expended by the critic, is employed on some eighteen occasions . . . The historical approach is also seen at its best."

In other words, the *De Thucydide* is a bad piece of criticism, done with great thoroughness. If we are to rank critics by the amount of "effort" they have expended, as children are graded in many so-called schools, we may well admit that Dionysius demonstrated some progress in critical power. It costs considerable effort to do this "recasting" of the original that is much admired by Bonner; but as a critical method recasting is on a level with the remarks made by people leaving a theatre, to the effect that, if they had written the play, they would have written it differently. Of course they would. They are not making valid criticisms; they are egotistically substituting themselves for the author.

The main theses of the book are therefore, I believe, unproved and unprovable. There are, however, a good many pages of careful analysis and a number of incidental remarks that have value. There is a brief bibliography, followed by an index.

R. K. HACK.

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI.

K. SCHUBRING. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der hippokratischen Schrift *De locis in homine*. Berlin, Junker und Dünnhaupt, 1941. Pp. 73. (*Neue Deutsche Forschungen*, Abt. Klassische Philologie, Band 228.)

The treatise *De locis in homine* is one of the more interesting books among the so-called Hippocratic writings. It faintly re-echoes the method of the great Hippocrates as outlined by Plato. The aetiology and therapy of diseases are based on a conscious and detailed study of the frame of the human body, foreshadowing in its "anatomical" scope the Hellenistic approach to medicine. Moreover, the essay abounds in general remarks concerning the healing art, its methods, its possibilities, and its connections with related departments of knowledge.

Apparently as a preparatory step for a new edition of the treatise which must still be read in Littré's edition of the works of Hippocrates (*Oeuvres complètes d'Hippocrate*, VI [1849], pp. 276 ff.), Schubring has studied the manuscript-tradition (chap. I), the early editions of the Renaissance (chap. II), and such quotations from the book as are to be found in ancient authors (chap. III).

I have no means of checking Schubring's description of the two classes of manuscripts in which *De locis* is preserved (A = Parisinus gr. 2253, s. XI; V = Vaticanus gr. 276, s. XII and its five derivatives). From what he says one certainly gains the impression that he has worked thoroughly and carefully. The result arrived at is that A and V are of equal value and that, whenever their readings disagree, a decision can be made only from the context of the passage (p. 30).

The study of the Renaissance editions is mainly concerned with the manuscripts used by the early editors and with the interdependence of these printings. Schubring thereby continues and partly corrects his earlier inquiries (cf. his exposé of the manuscripts in K. Deichgräber, *Hippokrates, Über Entstehung und Aufbau des menschlichen Körpers* [Περὶ σπαρκῶν], 1935, pp. vii ff.); he also takes up the investigations of Diller in regard to Hippocratic manuscripts and editions (cf. *Philol.*, Supplement XXIII [1932], Heft 3; *Gnomon*, XII [1936], pp. 367 ff.). The critical discussion of certain passages of *De locis* as given here and throughout Schubring's dissertation (cf. the index of these passages at the end of the book) will be of great value for all future references to this Hippocratic treatise until the new edition appears.

The last chapter is interesting because it definitely proves that the Hippocratic work, stimulating as it may seem to the modern, did not find much favor with the ancients. To be sure, it was included relatively early in the collection of Hippocratic writings (p. 71). Even Galen considered it genuine, as Schubring is now able to show by means of the recently published Arabic translation of Galen's commentary on the second book of the *Epidemiae* (p. 64). Yet, generally speaking, *De locis* did not play an important part in the discussion of Greek physicians, nor did the Arabs consider it worth their while to make a translation of it (p. 72). The book, independent and original in its outlook, did not fit into the picture of Hippocratic medicine as commonly adopted in late centuries, nor could it be accommodated to these "Hippocratic" views even by ancient critics, broadminded as they were in matters pertaining to the genuineness of writings.

LUDWIG EDELSTEIN.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

H. WAGENVOORT. *Imperium, Studiën over het "mana"-begrip in zede en taal der Romeinen.* Amsterdam, H. J. Paris, 1941.
Pp. 202.

The subtitle of this thorough and learned volume indicates its purpose. The Introduction describes the Austronesian concept of

mana (the mysterious power or fluidum associated with the warrior, the chieftain, the tribe, the priest, again with the knowledge of sacred words and formulas, and with animals, plants, inanimate objects, and the spirits of the dead), and illustrates the idea of the transfer of power by touch.

Chap. I, *Contactus*, starts with the adjective *augustus* as describing what is consecrated, above all *tempa sacerdotum rite dicata manu* (where the ceremony was one of holding the doorpost) and passes to the importance ascribed to contact with earth. Exhaustive consideration is given to the use of herbs, etc., by the *fetiales*,¹ in *lectisternia*, and in manumission, and to the grass of the place of sacrifice (pp. 29, 36: Vedic and Persian parallels suggest themselves); to the consecration of persons and objects; to *auguria* and *auspicia*; to the touching of altars, etc., and to the use of the stone, which is also Iuppiter Lapis, in oath-ceremonies. Chap. II, *Imperium*, discusses the acclamation of the victorious leader by that title and argues that *imperare* is not *in-paro* but is related to *parere*; *imperator* is to be "levens-verwekker" (p. 67), and *imperium* the mana of the chief.

Chap. III, *Numen, Novensiles en Indigetes*, shows the closeness of *numen* to mana, explains *novensiles* as *nou-ensiles* (p. 83; from *nuo* < *nōuō* < *nēuō*) and rightly rejects Koch's theory of the meaning of *indigetes*. Wagenvoort's analysis is searching and candid; he offers the alternative suggestion *indu-agens* or rather *qui indu agitur* (pp. 95 ff.; *indigitare* is treated as cognate). Chap. IV, *Gravitas en Maiestas*, illustrates the typical Roman emphasis on these words and argues that the basic sense of *gravitas* is weight in the literal sense, giving evidence from sophisticated times for emphasis on the physical weight or density of supernatural beings or objects. So *maiestas* is "size," but it is assigned to a period of more advanced development and credited with a greater degree of abstractness. Wagenvoort finds an analogy in *kabod* (pp. 108 ff.), quoting from Caspari the definition "die Summe alles dessen, wodurch einer (oder etwas) sich auszeichnet."

Chap. V, *Contagio*, discusses "strong" and "weak" mana, the notion of *contagio funesta* and the exclusion from certain ceremonials of slaves, foreigners, women, and persons in chains. Attention is paid also to *expiatio*; to ceremonies of passing through a door or other aperture,² Janus (pp. 153 ff.) and the *porta triumphalis* (pp. 158 f.); to the "polarity" of *contagio* and to rituals of passing over a person or thing (cf. Peter's shadow in Acts 5, 15: also Thurnwald, *Z. f. Ästhetik*, XXI [1927], p. 327 on Maori women stepping over a lizard to avert the evil which it threatens, and the same writer in M. Ebert, *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*, XIII, p. 166 for a Maori woman crossing a threshold to break the ban on it). Chap. VI, *Vis genitalis*, discusses *genius*, *iuno*, and the mana of the renewal of life. The conclusion is charming and modest (p. 187), and there is an excellent index.

¹ Here, as with the *corona graminea*, it is the grass of a particular site. Cf. the story in *Aen.*, I, 472 f. of the horses of Rhesus (so far as our evidence goes, a late version; it involves a symbolic taking possession of the earth).

² Add the Tartar custom discussed by M. Cary and A. D. Nock, *C. Q.*, XXI (1927), p. 122.

Wagenvoort sets up a simple basic principle and organizes around it a large mass of detail. In so doing he makes many good and acute observations; e.g. p. 16 that *augustus*, unlike *sacer*, is not ambivalent; pp. 16 ff. on the difference between *consecratio* and *dedicatio*;³ p. 37, n. 2 on the *inauguratio* of *pontifices*; p. 50, n. 2 on *asylum*; pp. 54 f. on the danger of leaning too heavily on Livy; p. 79 on Virgil's understanding of old piety; p. 82 "a primitive society knows no mere symbols"; pp. 100 f. on [AG]ON(ium) IND(igetis) in the Ostian Fasti; p. 124 on *maiestas senatus*.

The main thesis presents many difficulties to a reviewer, who should ideally be a master of Comparative Philology, Anthropology, Ancient Religion, Roman Law, and the Dutch language; *vae soli!* It is clearly pressed too far:⁴ past experience gives little ground for optimism as to inferences based on etymology; at best, they do not prove the meaning or associations of a word at any given time. Let us for a moment put aside detail and ask the basic question: how far is the whole approach justified? How far can we interpret Roman custom and language, *zede en taal*, from our knowledge of primitive peoples? And what is the value of anthropological parallels?⁵

Primitives, as commonly defined, make up an aggregate varying enormously in degree of development and in nature and nurture. Yet as a whole they differ from civilized men mainly in that they lack the art of writing, i.e. the use of convenient symbols sufficiently narrowed in meaning (a point emphasized by Thurnwald) and employed not only to transact ordinary business and to implement the use of magical formulas, but also to fix and preserve traditions and ideas. Ritual poems and ballads can live without writing but, in general, the free use of written characters is our continuity. Without it, man's mental horizon seldom extends more than three or five generations backwards (cf. W. Wyse on Isaeus, VII, 22 and E. Wüst in *R.-E.*, VII A, col. 324 on the lengths to which relationship was traced). Nevertheless, the primitive is not a different biological animal; he is by no means necessarily less sophisticated or less prone to make elaborate social and religious patterns; and his problems of subsistence and self-adjustment, physical and moral, are not altogether diverse from those of civilized man. Again, many of the characteristic forms of Roman life antedate at least any extended use of writing. Parallels have in fact been very illuminating; it is only through them that we understand the restrictions which hedged around the life of the *flamen Dialis*. Analogies will not teach us what happened in the past: they may help to keep our reconstructions within limits consistent with what is known to happen.

The concept of mana involves and formalizes an awareness of

³ That is, as used strictly; both can bear also a transferred sense.

⁴ Cf. G. M. A. Hanfmann, *C. W.*, XXXVI (1943), pp. 139 ff. Again, on p. 117, Propertius, II, 25, 22: *nulla diu femina pondus habet* simply means "any woman is fickle" and has nothing whatsoever to do with mana.

⁵ Cf. W. R. Halliday, *Greek and Roman Folk Lore*, pp. 4 f. M. P. Nilsson in Gericke-Norden, *Einleitung*, II, iv (ed. 4), pp. 58 ff.; H. J. Rose, *Concerning Parallels* (Frazer Lecture, 1934); Nock, *Gnomon*, XV (1939), pp. 18 f.

overtones in the world, a feeling that persons and things contain or are moved by unseen forces, a recognition that one person or thing is more effective than another person or thing of the same kind. There is a sense that all around man are potentialities for good or evil which affect him and which should somehow be applied to his purpose or, if dangerous, should be so treated as to be made of no effect. Things are not just as they seem: their unseen qualities are communicated by touch or taste or smell, along the channels of the senses.

The term mana is Polynesian and other peoples have words for a corresponding category;⁶ but something like the notion is part of all supernaturalism, high or low, and affords what R. R. Marett called "a minimum definition of religion,"⁷ and Nilsson "the first seed-ground of religion itself."⁸ So awareness of "power" may fairly be called an universal substratum or datum of human consciousness. Neither Greece nor Rome has any term as extensive and yet specific as mana, orenda, wakonda, but the notion of power and of its transference is clearly present and *numen* is nearer to mana than any Greek word is. H. J. Rose, who made this observation, has proved for Rome the superimposition of a personal on an impersonal view of supernatural (or, as Nilsson would put it, supranormal) action.⁹ His demonstration is the more noteworthy in that the concept of "power" commonly co-exists not only with that of supernatural and ghostly personalities but also with primitive ideas of High Gods,¹⁰ and emerges, sometimes with special vigor, in developed prophetic religions. Rose has shown a specific change of ideas which involves more than the transference to particular deities of rites originally effective in themselves. Nevertheless, I suspect that, as far back as anything like Latin was spoken, an element of anthropomorphism was attached to some aspects of the supernatural. Wagenvoort himself cautions us (pp. 117 ff.) against an over simple distinction between dynamistic and animistic stages, and remarks on the significance of the form Iuppiter as asserting fatherhood. Iuppiter may in a notable way have supplied a focus for crystallization. The change was probably one of gradual evolution, one of degree rather than of kind. *Sive deus sive dea* and *sive mas sive femina* show vagueness of outline; and yet, as Altheim remarked,¹¹ they indicate

⁶ For the term "category," cf. Nilsson, *Rev. Hist. Phil. Rel.*, X (1930), p. 124.

⁷ *The Threshold of Religion*, p. 2. Cf. E. Arbman, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.*, XXIX (1931), pp. 304 f., in an article very well worth reading.

⁸ *History of Greek Religion*, p. 166.

⁹ *Harv. Theol. Rev.*, XXVIII (1935), pp. 237 ff. and in *Custom Is King, Essays Presented to R. R. Marett* (1936), pp. 51 ff. For superimposition, cf. Marett, *op. cit.*, pp. 120 f. and Nilsson, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.*, XXII (1923-4), pp. 382 f. For *numen*, note Mela, I, 75 (of the Corycian cave), *totus autem augustus et vere sacer, habitarique a diis et dignus et creditus, nihil non venerabile et quasi cum aliquo numine se ostentat*, cited by Wagenvoort, p. 15, n. 4, for the combination of *augustus* and *sacer*.

¹⁰ G. van der Leeuw, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.*, XXIX (1931), p. 96.

¹¹ *History of Roman Religion* (tr. H. Mattingly), p. 229 (italics are mine).

that deity was conceived as either in male or female form, i. e. as possessing sex. In the Arval hymn Mars is a fully developed personality invoked in prayer and not compelled by magic (E. Norden, *Aus altrömischen Priesterbüchern*, p. 150); and yet then and later the peculiarity of *numen* continues. Among modern primitives also there is a measure of alternation between a personal and an impersonal view.

We need not shrink from using the analogy of mana whenever we are dealing with what was specifically religious at Rome. Can we, with Wagenvoort, extend the concept to wider areas in private and public law, and in civic life? Mana and its parallels are associated with secular no less than with religious powers and skills: mana is an universal category, above the other differentiations of the world. Now the Romans invested civil (as also religious) office with a greater emotional aura of prestige than is found in the Greek republics.¹² The gods have *maiestas*¹³ and so have the people and the *magistratus*, whose very name is cognate; and exactly the same concept of magnitude is expressed in the sacrificial formula *macte esto*. Such phrases as *maiestas laesa*, *maiestas violata* have a distinct suggestion of sacrilege: cf. Ulpian, *apud Dig.*, XLVIII, 4, 1: *proximum sacrilegio crimen est, quod maiestatis dicitur* (and in Ulpian it is still an offence against the Roman people and not against the princeps). *Maiestas* is almost the secular counterpart of *numen*. A *magistratus* possessed not only *imperium* but also *auspicia*, the conduct of public affairs in the national and supernatural sphere.

Wagenvoort indeed finds more of the "primitive" in *gravitas*; I am inclined to disagree. Certainly the concept that weight was characteristic of the supernatural lingered in and after the Augustan Age¹⁴ and appears in Christian writers. Further, a Roman did not use a dictionary distinguishing between primary and secondary meanings. Nevertheless, the main connotation of *gravitas* was that of morality, disciplined dignity, and all that went with the normal Roman ideal of the responsible individual—all that is implicit in *Aeneid*, I, 151, *pietate gravem ac meritis*. Is there any more notion of weight as supernatural here than in Tennyson's

¹² Greek has the generalized title *ἀρχῶν*, and contrast between *ἀρχῶν* and *ἰδιώτης*, the proverb *ἀρχὴ ἀνδρα δεῖξει* ("office will show the man"); cf. Plutarch, *Apophth. Lac.*, *Ages.*, 6, p. 208 D)—in other words the counterpart of *magistratus*, but nothing native corresponding to *imperium*, which is a more extensive term. (Cf. proconsular *imperium* and in the later Roman Republic *privati cum imperio*.) Can you imagine an exact Greek equivalent of Gellius, I, 13, 3, *cuius id negotium pontificiumque esset*, as a metaphor? It may be appropriate to adduce the contrast made by E. Kornemann, *Die Antike*, VIII (1932), p. 108, between the Romans with their sanctity of walls and doors and the Greeks of whom he quotes von Gerkan's words "die Stadtmauer gilt hier nur als Zweckbau und hat in diesem Sinne mit dem Staatskult nie das Geringste zu tun." The only sentiment attached to the Greek wall is that of patriotism (cf. Heraclitus, Frag. 44).

¹³ Cf. *T.L.L.*, VIII, col. 152 and, *ibid.*, col. 153, its use in the "Itala" to render *δόξα*. Pliny, *Paneg.*, 4, 6 contrasts *maiestas* and *humanitas*.

¹⁴ To Wagenvoort's examples add Lucan, I, 56 f. but subtract VIII, 724 (it needs no supernatural attribute to make a corpse heavy to carry through low water).

Wearing all that weight
Of learning lightly like a flower?

We should hardly connect ὕψος, "height" in the treatise *On the Sublime* with the undoubted belief that supernatural beings and some ghosts were taller than ordinary people! These are natural, in fact inevitable, metaphors, like the transferred use of μέγας, or ηὗξανόμην ἀκούων in Aristophanes, *Vesp.* 638 or ἐγένετο πλεῖον ἡ δεκαπλάσιος in Plato, *Euthyd.* 300 D, or *sublimi feriam sidera vertice* in Horace, *Carm.*, I, 1, 36. To meet Wagenvoort on his own ground, *gravitas* is a quality which you ought to possess, while *mana* is an attribute which you would like to possess. (The private individual, *qua* private individual, does not have *maiestas*.)

Shall we follow Wagenvoort in his interpretation of the custom of acclaiming as *imperator* a victorious general? His etymology from *parere* is not acceptable (so Professor Whatmough assures me), and it is paradoxical to treat phrases like *imperare vitibus* as anything but derivative. We may allow that the word came from the battlefield and not from the Senate house, and that its adoption by Sulla and Julius Caesar and Octavian suggests "certain élément religieux, ou, du moins, magique sur laquelle la mystique nouvelle pouvait s'appuyer."¹⁵ It clearly implied *felicitas*; *imperator* was suggestive of *invictus*, a word expressive of emotion (e. g. *Aen.*, VI, 365 and *Livy*, II, 50, 5), and involved a personal charisma. In any event, *imperator* described the general (whether consul, praetor, pro-magistrate, or *privatus cum imperio*) in relation to his troops and it is applied to gods and to foreigners; such a term as *consul* is hardly ever transferred to members of either category.

The easiest explanation of the use of *imperator* in acclamations is given by Appian, *B. C.*, II, 177 "as though the soldiers testified that their commanders deserved that rank," καθάπερ αὐτοῖς ἐπιμαρτυρούντων ἀξίως σφῶν αὐτοκράτορας εἶναι. It is a spontaneous action, without constitutional consequences: *imperator* is here "general" rather than "possessor of *imperium*." Is the practice old? To be sure, *Livy*, XXVII, 19, 4 neither asserts nor implies innovation. Further, even in earlier times soldiers and populace alike can hardly have regarded their generals in the impersonal manner of Cato in his writing of history;¹⁶ and war must have been more individualistic before the introduction of hoplite tactics.¹⁷

Nevertheless, there is no previous trace, historical or legendary, of the use of the acclamation *imperator*, and the custom may have arisen as a product of foreign wars conducted by promagistrates¹⁸

¹⁵ J. Gagé, *Rev. Hist.*, CLXXVII (1936), p. 339; cf. J. Carcopino, *Points de vue sur l'impérialisme Romain*, pp. 126 ff. and A. von Premerstein, *Vom Werden u. Wesen d. Prinzipats* (*Abh. Münch.*, N. F., XV [1937]), pp. 256 ff. There is a special irony in Catullus, 29, 11, *imperator unice*.

¹⁶ Cf. *Livy*, XLII, 49, 3 ff. (171 B. C.) cited by J. Stroux, *Die Antike*, XIII (1937), pp. 203 f. Stroux regards the description as abridged from Polybius.

¹⁷ Cf. Nilsson, *J. R. S.*, XIX (1929), pp. 1 ff. I dare not enter on the problem of the *conjuratio*; cf. K. Latte, *Gött. Nachr.*, 1934, I, iii, pp. 66 ff. and F. Altheim, *Lex sacra (Albae Vigiliae, I [1940])*, pp. 19 ff.

¹⁸ G. de Sanctis, *Studi S. Riccobono*, II.

and involving a more personal relation between the soldiers and their general than was felt towards the consuls with their alternation of power. If the answer to the question lies therefore in Livy's lost second Decade, the phenomenon belongs to a milieu very different from that in which arose the ceremonies discussed in the first chapter. Even so, it is too early to be explained by Hellenistic ideas of *theioi anthropoi* or by the re-emergence in later Greek religion of the idea of power. Whatever its origin, *imperator* at least acquired a notable element of mana in the sense in which that word is today metaphorically used.

It is hard to do full justice to this book; reading it as I have, with a dictionary, I must have missed many nuances. Further there remains a deep and perhaps an unanswerable question as to the extent to which the formulas and symbolic, almost sacramental, acts of Roman legal procedure are to be explained from religious concepts.¹⁹ Certainly these formulas and acts, and *ius* and *fas* alike, are not simple elements in a bloodless construction: like the formulas and ceremonies of Roman religion, they are penetrated by a deep feeling that things must be done in the one right way, under the one system of authority valid for a Roman; and after all, according to tradition, the *ius respondendi* originally belonged to the *pontifices* alone and the *formulae actionis* were in their archives. In some sense we can therefore find a psychological unity in many of the data which in this book are set side by side. The pattern is one of action and not, as in Polynesia, of categorization; the basis is that of common humanity. In the interests of classification we may define the situation more closely: it will be our definition and not a Roman definition; and yet the effort brings out important non-rational components: "Indess soll der Mensch sich die Aufgabe nicht desshalb verkleinern, um sich seine Unzulänglichkeit dadurch zu verbergen."

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

CLARENCE W. MENDELL. *Our Seneca*. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press, 1941. Pp. viii + 285. \$3.00.

The title of Professor Mendell's book immediately suggested to the reviewer an affectionate treatment to follow of Rome's great dramatist, but he was not long in discovering that, while the author had borrowed Roger Ascham's phrase, he had not simultaneously acquired the Elizabethan's love for Seneca, a love which survived his appreciation, unusual for his time, of relativity in dramatic appraisal. This much then by way of warning: Seneca lovers will find their

¹⁹ The analogies in Teutonic law are striking: cf. Müller-Bergström in Bächtold-Stäubli and Hoffmann-Krayer, *Handwörterbuch d. deutschen Aberglaubens*, VII, col. 553 and Sartori, *ibid.*, cols. 1094 f. (Greece and India are not analogous). Cf. also Thurnwald in M. Ebert, *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*, XI, p. 319 (*s. v.* "Schrift"). There is much for classical scholars in this article, as in those of the same writer on *Fortschritt*, *Politische Entwicklung*, *Primitive Kultur*, *Primitives Denken*, *Recht*, *Totenkultus*, etc.).

hero pricked with a bare bodkin on many a page and reproved more than once for his "unconquerably bad taste."

Now taste is notoriously a touchy subject on which to write or speak. Taste is the thing that governs the *convenances* of society in a given time at a given place under given *mores*, quite irrationally perhaps but more than likely in approximate accordance with the soul and mind of the given subject at the particular time. It is really unfair to set off against one another the tastes of very different periods and very different conditions of life. Missionary converts coming from Africa to America or Britain are horrified at our women's backless evening gowns; they seem to think that the altogether of the African jungles is in better taste. Both are right, our ladies and the African converts, but not in the same time and at the same place. Seneca was in perfect taste for his age, even if that age may seem to us a little bizarre in its likes and dislikes. Mendell himself in his powerfully written and widely comprehensive second chapter (*Senecan Background*) seems to the reviewer to have shown that Seneca was the perfectly natural product of his age; thus, if Seneca's taste must be condemned, let the indictment be drawn rather against the age. Mendell himself recognizes this on p. 189, and an earlier recognition of it would undoubtedly have led to the elimination of some of the slaps and pokes at Seneca from which he has earlier been unable to refrain.

It needs to be realized, it would appear, that Seneca, knowing all the Greek dramas that we possess and many more, and valuing them, did not want to write that way, not that he feared the competition but that he thought he had something more effective; and for the people for whom he wrote, it was definitely more effective. There is a very great deal of Elizabethan drama, including no small part of Shakespeare, which might be condemned by us on various grounds of present day taste, but it was effective for its day. And in any case Mendell allows that Seneca did in many ways follow quite successfully leads of Euripides, who was a very considerable dramatist even if not an Aeschylus or a Sophocles.

The chapters in which the author studies Seneca's handling of various phases of drama enter naturally into close detail and, to be appreciated as they deserve to be, need constant checking against the many references to the Senecan plays and the tragedies of Greece which occur in them. Opinion will vary on the relative value of these chapters; the reviewer recommends particularly those on dramatic technique, long speeches, and stock characters, and would like to have seen the chapter on dialogue much expanded.

Now all of these chapters seem to lead up to Chap. XI, entitled Conclusion. This is the chapter which might well have been doubled or tripled in length, because, by and large, a very important matter is here handled, namely, the influence of Seneca on English drama. But the author rather backs away from the subject, apparently in modest dread of contemporary Titans in the field of English, and adds the chapter only because not to add it would be "unsportsmanlike." With that sentiment one may agree, because the uninformed person reading the earlier chapters might conclude that Seneca, constantly juxtaposed as he is to his disadvantage with the mighty Three of Athenian tragedy, is a shabby sort of stage improviser at

the best and something much less complimentary at the worst. The reviewer who had read patiently and hopefully to reach Chap. XI, was frankly disappointed with its summary character, because Mendell makes it clear that he is eminently capable of contributing a full-length study here which would become a classic in all well-conducted seminars of English drama. He knows and he has recorded "the most fruitful lines of investigation," and it could be wished that he had extended himself on them. In this final chapter the powerful influence of Senecan tragedy on Elizabethan drama is well summed up in the emphasis put on the discipline, first of dramatic form, second of search for the effective word, imposed by Seneca on the Elizabethans.

Yet in the chapter's final sentence, which is also the last word of the study, Mendell cannot forbear from picking up the stick again to beat the poor dog once more. ". . . Seneca by means of his own mediocrity, which was understandable and human, gave to the predecessors of Shakespeare as much as they could absorb of a far greater drama than either he or they could comprehend." But can we be so sure that we comprehend the spirit of Greek tragedy to the point of pronouncing positively that Seneca did not, just because he wrote plays adapted to his own age and was not foolish enough to try to compete with plays suited for another? Seneca may very well have understood and admired many of those things so praised in Sophocles by Mendell because Seneca was a man of very high intelligence, appreciation, and cultivation, but for all that may have seen their impossibility for dramatic use in his time.

The volume ends with two verse translations by the author, one of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* and the other of Seneca's *Oedipus*. It is not very clear that anything is achieved by this appendage to the volume, unless perhaps under circumstances where Mendell could be present in person to comment on his own renderings and make the desired applications. It must be frankly said that a number of lines in these translations, as well as in those given here and there in the earlier portion of the book, are very dubiously capable of scansion, while the twenty-eighth line on page 210 is obviously octosyllabic only in the midst of decasyllables. The translation of the *Oedipus* of Seneca is, in the reviewer's opinion, much better than that of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, and perhaps that may be taken to indicate that Seneca has corrupted Mendell himself, so that despite the Roman's sins of omission and commission, of which the author is deeply conscious and on which he has been specifically informative, the devil, as so often happens, has his way and speaks through him as a mouthpiece. If that is Mendell's plight in regard to Seneca's tragedies, he has the full and understanding sympathy of the reviewer who is something of an addiet himself. By the way, it is hardly fair to throw the two Oedipuses into contrast except for special purposes; Seneca's *Oedipus* is by no means his best tragedy.

In the introduction, p. viii, the statement "28-14 Augustus in power" should of course read "28 B.C.-14 A.D." which is different. On p. 36, line 6, "overplus" would seem a happier word than "plussage." On p. 67, line 19, correct "unhappy." On p. 136, line 8 and line 17, we encounter the "dactylic" hexameter, between which and exactitude there is an "l" of a difference. On p. 203,

last line, the word should be "hailing." On p. 204, line 21, and in numerous other places the reviewer would suppose that "an" and not "and" was desired. On p. 212, fourth line from the foot, not "aye" but "ay." The status of capital G in God, over which John Morley tripped heavily in his younger days, seems to be needlessly assailed, e. g., p. 244, last line of Oedipus' first speech. Commas are rather stingily provided in the translations, and on p. 246, third line from the foot, a semicolon is required after "evil."

WILLIAM HARDY ALEXANDER.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY.

JAMES H. OLIVER. *The Sacred Gerousia*. American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1941. Pp. xiv + 204. (*Hesperia, Supplement VI.*)

Some inscriptions recently found in the Athenian Agora mentioned the Sacred Gerousia at Athens and threw light both on the approximate date of its foundation (after the middle of the second century after Christ) and the combined religious and political character of its activities. This discovery led Dr. Oliver to make a comprehensive study of this obscure municipal institution, which differs sharply from the ordinary "social" gerousia found in many cities of Asia Minor and from the "Dorian" type which is an integral part of the city government. He very reasonably derives it from the Gerousia at Ephesus as reconstituted by Lysimachus, while admitting the long interval of time and the changes of function that set the latter apart from both the Ephesian Gerousia of the second century after Christ and the Sacred Gerousia at Athens. In this connection one may reasonably argue that Strabo's phrase regarding the Lysimachian Gerousia (*καὶ διώκοντ πάντα*) refers specifically to its actual powers of control over other organs of government, though granting to the author, as one must, that it did not supersede them. Lysimachus favored oligarchical arrangements, which may not have survived him long. Successive chapters deal with the later Gerousia at Ephesus, the other Sacred Gerousiai of Hyettus, Stratonicia, Caria, Prusias ad Hypium, Tralles, Apameia, Thessalonica, Philippopolis, and Aenus, and the terminology, officers, members, and Roman overseers relating to each. The author concludes that the Sacred Gerousia became an instrument of imperial policy in a general attempt to revitalize the spiritual values of the old Greek and Roman world against spiritual forces of a new and subversive character, a policy more subtle than that of open intolerance of these new forces.

Extremely valuable is the collection of 63 documents (4 of them, nos. 24, 25, 31, 32, previously unpublished) with text, translation, and commentary, which forms the larger portion of the work. The author's care and skill are everywhere evident and he has been able to improve most of the texts in the re-editing, even one so frequently studied as that of C. Vibius Salutaris of Ephesus (no. 3). The very minuteness of the few points that the reviewer would remark indicates

how well the work has been done. Page 14: it is perhaps better to use the forms Tios or Tieion (Strabo) for Philetaerus' birth-place, since Teos recalls the Ionian city. Page 40, note 3: Philadelphia (Ala *Şehir*) belongs rather to Lydia than to Phrygia. Page 87: it is disputable, but seems more probable to me, that the priesthood of Servilius Isauricus at Ephesus relates, not to the elder Isauricus whose presence in Asia remains unattested, but rather to his son, the governor of Asia in 46-44 B. C., who won great popularity in the province by his work of restoration and reorganization (see Münzer, *Röm. Adelsparteien*, p. 356, n. 2, and opposed, Keil, *Forsch. Ephesos*, III, no. 66). But these points apply only to a few details. The whole is an excellent contribution to the study of ancient city institutions under the Roman Empire.

T. ROBERT S. BROUGHTON.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

Desiderius Erasmus. *The Praise of Folly. Translated from the Latin, with an Essay and Commentary, by Hoyt HOPEWELL HUDSON.* Princeton, Princeton Univ. Press, 1941. Pp. xli + 166. \$2.50.

In 1509, Erasmus, who had just arrived in England, was confined to his quarters by an attack of lumbago and deprived of his usual academic employments by the failure of his library to cross the Channel as quickly as he. During these moments of enforced leisure, he wrote the *Moriae Encomium*, which has probably done more to assure his subsequent reputation than the New Testament or patristic studies on which he placed so high a value. When Erasmus wrote this book, he was doing nothing unusual; he was, in fact, writing in a tradition. The Renaissance scholar never thought of himself as a slave to collation or annotation; almost invariably he was also a man of letters. The literary ambitions of most terminated in the publication of quartos of Latin verse of uneven merit and thickness; but, when the muse was prose, the satire, and often the mock encomium, was a natural consequence. The vast folios of Dornavius are monuments to this second inclination.

Of all the mock encomiums of the sixteenth century, the *Moriae Encomium* was the most popular. In 1549, Chaloner, an English Latin poet, translated it into the vernacular, for even the men of that Latin-speaking age must have found its vocabulary difficult. It was translated again by Wilson in 1668 and by Kennet in 1683. The Kennet version has been frequently reprinted, and, owing to the fact that Peter Eckler, an Ingersollian atheist-printer, saw in the work fit ammunition for his cause, it has had a wide American circulation. All of these early translations are, according to modern standards, impossible. They clip and distort the original; they alter meanings and add new asides; and they omit difficult constructions. A fourth translation by Copner appeared in 1878, but the edition was so limited that few have ever seen it. A new and faithful translation of this work was obviously required, and for that reason alone Professor Hudson's version is most welcome.

I have made a line for line comparison of this translation with the text established by Kan and I have nothing but praise for the accuracy and skill with which Hudson has turned this rather difficult book into graceful and readable English. As I compared the translation with the Latin text, I found frequent occasion to admire the translator's good sense and judgment. Erasmus writes, for example, "cum sene Plautino ad tres illas litteras revertitur"; a literal translation of this clause would confound the ordinary reader; but Hudson, properly consulting the *Mercator*, translates it: "like the old gentleman in Plautus, he goes back to conning those three letters, *a, m, o.*" Other intelligent renderings are: "and thus flatters himself in the key of C-major" for "sibique majorem in modum plaudit"; "and have just come through with their shirts" for "vixque nudi emerserint"; and "so bought off that with a clean slate he may start from scratch upon a new round of sins" for "ita redimi, ut jam liceat ad novum scelerum orbem de integro reverti."

On a few occasions Hudson's literary genius gets the upper hand. I doubt whether the meaning of "latifundium" should be extended to "goodly freeholds with broad acres" (p. 45); I also wonder whether "quid cum aliis exosculatur naevum in amica" should be localized as "the mole on his mistress's neck" (p. 26). Erotic blemishes should be left to the reader's imagination. Here and there, I found other matters for quibbling. I think that "chess" is a better equivalent for "latrunculus" than "checkers" (p. 3); and I doubt whether Erasmus meant "pumpkin" (p. 53) when he wrote "eucurbita." There are other pedantical points of this nature, but in no way do they detract from the brilliance of this translation.

Professor Hudson also supplies the reader with a semi-popular prefatory essay on the background and purpose of the *Moriae Encomium*. He appends a rhetorical analysis of the work, some pages of explanatory notes, and an index of proper names. For the sake of the ordinary reader the notes might have been fuller, but the ordinary reader's well-known impatience with annotations undoubtedly moved Hudson to spare himself. I feel, however, that this new translation would be pleasing to the original author, and I recommend it as a pattern for future translators of later Latin authors.

DON CAMERON ALLEN.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

KENNETH W. CLARK. Eight American Praxapostoloi. Chicago,
Univ. of Chicago Press, 1941. Pp. 204; 8 plates. \$2.00.

This book, a very satisfactory example of the planographic process, is an outgrowth of Professor Clark's earlier volume, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Greek New Testament Manuscripts in America*, and presents a collation of eight of the ten MSS he found in American libraries which contain wholly or in part the text of the Acts and Epistles of the Apostles. Since two of these ten, P⁴⁶ and O26 are quite fragmentary and have already been published, they are omitted, but 876, although it too had previously been published, is for the sake of

completeness and convenience included in Sanders' revised version. This gives the eight *Praxapostoloi* of the title, eight manuscripts, that is, which originally contained all the Acts and Epistles together. All of the eight "are of mediaeval date, ranging from the twelfth to the fourteenth centuries" (p. 3) and present a mixed text with numerous "western" readings. Omitted from the collation are certain papyrus fragments, notably Michigan 1571, manuscripts of complete New Testaments, and lectionary texts of the Acts and Epistles of which there are three in American libraries.

After the Introduction (pp. 1-5), of which the above paragraph is a summary, the author gives in his second chapter (pp. 6-28) a description of each manuscript and its history, with references to his predecessors who have noticed or collated it. Since his primary purpose was to furnish material that might be "completely and permanently available for textual research" (p. 13), he refrains from extended discussion of the affiliation of these manuscripts. He does emphasize, however, "the textual inter-relationship" among four of them (876, 1799, 2401, 2412) and in this connection refers to "Family 2412" (pp. 13, 22); not until p. 25, where he speaks of "the special text-type of Family 2412" is the reader referred to the discussion of this matter on pp. 35-36. Here the author advances the hypothesis, "now assuredly verified," that 2412 "belongs to the textual group traditionally headed by Codex 614." A check of the readings in the Catholic Epistles supports this conclusion, but, when Clark goes further and attempts to show that 2412 should supplant 614 as head of the family, his argument involves, it seems to the reviewer, a *petitio principii*. "The dating of 2412," he remarks (p. 35), "has become an important matter in view of its textual importance as chief member of Family 2412." This position, however, is precisely what has to be proved and the proof must depend upon the priority in age and quality of 2412 as compared with 614. This priority, he says, is now assuredly verified but he presents no evidence and admits that his further hypothesis, that "Codex 2412, older than Codex 614, may be the very exemplar used for the latter MS," although "still quite plausible," is "more difficult to demonstrate." It is to be hoped that the further studies he has made will present his arguments in a clearer and more logical form.

The collation of the eight MSS (pp. 39-204), which reports the variants from the 1663 Lloyd-Sanday reprint of Mill's edition of Stephanus 1550, is presented in composite form and includes all the variants however slight. As far as the reviewer can judge, the work seems to have been done with exceeding care and thoroughness. Although a proper evaluation of the material here presented must be left to the specialist, I may note that some at least of the rarer variants have interesting connections. Thus in Acts 8, 26, MS 2401 has ἀναστὰς πορεύθητι with D, 40, and the Yale papyrus fragment.¹ In Acts 7, 14, MS 223 has ἐν ἐβδομήκοντα πέντε ψυχαῖς, a reading found in H and in the Thanksgiving at the Mass in the Apostolic Constitutions VIII, 6, whereas D, 614, and 2412 insert καὶ between the numerals. In Acts 19, 5, MSS 1799 and 2412 have the longer form Χριστοῦ εἰς ἄφεσιν ἀμαρτῶν with D and the Michigan papyrus

¹ Ed. by C. H. Kraeling in *Quantulacumque, Studies presented to Kirsopp Lake* (London, Christopher's, 1937), pp. 163-72.

fragment. In I Tim. 6, 19, only 1022 has *οὐτῶς* against *αἰωνίον* of KLP and the Old Latin. I may note also that in the Catholic Epistles, of the twenty-nine cases where readings of 876 have no Greek support, in one case only does it receive support from these new MSS: III John 1, 6, where 2412 adds *ἀληθεῖα καὶ*.

The book ends with eight excellent facsimiles, reproduced from the earlier *Catalogue*, of one page from each of the MSS. Clark deserves the thanks of biblical scholars for the completion of what must have been an arduous task.

MARBURY B. OGLE.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

(It is impossible to review all books submitted to the JOURNAL, but all are listed under *BOOKS RECEIVED*. Contributions sent for review or notice are not returnable.)

Alexander (William Hardy). Seneca's *Dialogi* III, IV, V. *De Ira Libri Tres. The Text Emended and Explained.* *Univ. of California Publ. in Classical Philology*, XII, 12 (1943), pp. 225-254.

Amyx (D. A.). Corinthian Vases in the Hearst Collection at San Simeon. *Univ. of California Publ. in Classical Archaeology*, I (1943), pp. 207-240; plates 28-32.

Cherniss (Harold). The Biographical Fashion in Literary Criticism. *Univ. of California Publ. in Classical Philology*, XII, 15 (1943), pp. 279-292.

Donohue (James J.). The Theory of Literary Kinds. Ancient Classifications of Literature. Dubuque, Iowa, *The Loras College Press*, 1943. Pp. vii + 155. \$2.00.

Emeneau (M. B.). A Dravidian Etymology of the Sanskrit Proper Name Nala. *Univ. of California Publ. in Classical Philology*, XII, 13 (1943), pp. 255-262.

Hart (Walter Morris). High Comedy in the *Odyssey*. *Univ. of California Publ. in Classical Philology*, XII, 14 (1943), pp. 263-278.

Laistner (M. L. W.), with the collaboration of King (H. H.). A Hand-List of Bede Manuscripts. Ithaca, *Cornell Univ. Press*, 1943. Pp. x + 168. \$3.00.

Mueller (Sister Mary Magdeleine). The Vocabulary of Pope St. Leo the Great. Washington, D. C., *Catholic Univ. of America Press*, 1943. Pp. xviii + 269. (Diss.)

Oldfather, William Abbott, Classical Studies in Honor of. Urbana, *Univ. of Illinois Press*, 1943. Pp. vii + 217; 7 plates. \$4.00.

Weiss (Helene). Kausalität und Zufall in der Philosophie des Aristoteles. Basel, *Verlag Haus zum Falken*, 1942. Pp. 197.